Capt. Forbes. R.N.
Seabank.

T.F. Torrance

3d

With the Author's

compliments & respects.

SCS #1313

A UNITED CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, ENGLAND, AND IRELAND ADVOCATED.

A DISCOURSE

ON

THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION

TO WHICH ARE ADDED

PROOFS AND ILLUSTRATIONS DESIGNED TO FORM A MANUAL OF REFORMATION FACTS AND PRINCIPLES.

BY

CHARLES WORDSWORTH, D.C.L.

BISHOP OF ST. ANDREWS, ETC.

EDINBURGH:

EDMONSTON AND DOUGLAS.

MDCCCLXI.

EDINBURGH: PRINTED BY THOMAS CONSTABLE

FOR

EDMONSTON AND DOUGLAS.

LONDON . . . . HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.
CAMBRIDGE . . . MACMILLAN & CO.
DUBLIN . . . . W. ROBERTSON.
GLASGOW. . . . JAMES MACLEHOSE.

SCS #1313

TO

THE MINISTERS AND ELDERS

OF THE

PRESBYTERIAN COMMUNITIES

THROUGHOUT SCOTLAND,

THE FOLLOWING DISCOURSE

IS RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED,

WITH THE AUTHOR'S EARNEST PRAYER,

THAT WHAT HE VENTURES TO OFFER

IN A SPIRIT OF PATRIOTISM AND CHRISTIAN LOVE,

MAY BE RECEIVED AND JUDGED

IN THE SAME SPIRIT.

PREFACE.

THE two main objects of the Author in the following Discourse,[1] are :—

First, To do justice, so far as in him lies, to the occasion which calls it forth, viz., the general observance of the Tercentenary of the Reformation of 1560.

Secondly, To advocate *a Union* between the Church Establishments of Scotland and England, in other words, *throughout the United Kingdom,* upon Scriptural and Reformation principles, in the interests of the Truth and Peace, with a view to domestic, social, and national benefits, and without the sacrifice of national independence.

In executing this design, the Author has not attempted to draw attention to the great Scottish æra of 1560 in its political aspects. Not that he undervalues the advantages which have accrued from the Reformation in that respect; but because

[1] Delivered at St. Andrews, December 18; at Dunfermline, December 19; and at Perth, December 22, 1860.

it would have carried him beyond the duty which he proposed to himself as a preacher of the Gospel, if he had undertaken to treat of that portion of the subject. In the view which he *has* taken, he has endeavoured to condense all the more essential elements of the Religious Movement, which was brought to a crisis by the alternative—virtually presented to our Reformers by the last Provincial Council in 1559—of *being put to the stake, or of submitting to the Decrees of Trent;* and which, having given birth to the *Confession of Faith* and *Book of Discipline,* reached its consummation in the first meeting of the GENERAL ASSEMBLY, held at Edinburgh on the 20th of December 1560.

The second portion of Contents, entitled *Proofs and Illustrations,* will be found to contain various matters, which, though necessary or desirable to substantiate the Author's argument, and to justify his views, were unavoidably excluded, if not by the character, by the limits of a "Discourse."

CONTENTS.

PAGE

A DISCOURSE ON THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION, . . . 1

PROOFS AND ILLUSTRATIONS, ETC. ETC.—

1. APPEAL OF REFORMERS TO HOLY SCRIPTURE—RESISTANCE TO THIS APPEAL ON THE PART OF THEIR OPPONENTS, 49

2. THE LAST PROVINCIAL COUNCIL, 1559, ... 54

3. APPEAL OF REFORMERS TO PRIMITIVE ANTIQUITY, . . 73

4. REFORMERS' APPEAL TO SCRIPTURE WHEREIN MISDIRECTED —ORIGIN OF PURITANISM, ... 95

5. KNOX AND THE ENGLISH REFORMERS, ... 107

6. DEFECTS OF REFORMATION DUE ORIGINALLY TO EXCESSES OF POPERY, ... 127

7. EVILS OF NATIONAL DISUNION IN ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS, 143

Calvin on Popery.

"It is you [the adherents of the Pope] who have fallen away from the customs of the Primitive Bishops. You have changed the ancient and holy Order. The Fathers never countenanced, nor would they tolerate this shameless usurpation of one Bishop over all the rest." —*De necessitate Reformandæ Ecclesiæ.*—Calv. *Op.* VIII. 60.

Calvin on Episcopacy.

"If they would shew us an Hierarchy, in which the pre-eminence of Bishops should be placed upon such a footing, that they would not refuse to be subject unto Christ, and to depend upon Him as their only Head"—in allusion to the assumed Headship of the Bishop of Rome—"and in which they would so cultivate a mutual Brotherhood, as to acknowledge no other bond of union than the Truth of God; then, indeed, if there be any who would not reverence such an Hierarchy, and pay it the most entire obedience, they would be worthy, I confess, of every possible anathema."—*Ibid.*

For the opinion of Luther, see below, p. 29, note.

DISCOURSE

ON

THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

"The Word of the Lord of hosts came unto me, saying, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, . . . Love the truth and peace."—ZECH. viii. 18, 19.

THIS is one of those short but emphatic and comprehensive precepts of universal duty with which the Word of God abounds. The more we meditate upon it, the more the lessons which it contains appear to be inexhaustible. It is not said merely, "Speak the Truth," or, "Do the Truth," but *love* it. Again, it is not said, "Seek Peace," or "Ensue Peace," but *love* Peace. And the order of these rules is no less pregnant with Divine instruction than the rules themselves. We are *first* to love the Truth, and *then* to love Peace. There are many who would persuade us to invert this order. Nay, there are many who would teach us to be indifferent to the Truth, and require us to be zealous only in the cause of Peace. But what God hath joined to-

16

gether, let not man put asunder. The Truth *and* Peace is the union which He has made. The Truth *before* Peace is the precedence which He has given. So speaks the Prophet, or rather God, by the Prophet's mouth, in the text. So, too, writes the great Apostle, or rather the Spirit, by the pen of the Apostle, in his Epistle to the Philippians—"And this I pray, that your *love* may abound yet more and more"—first, in what?—"in knowledge and in all judgment, that ye may approve things that are excellent;" in other words, that ye may *love the Truth;* —and next, "that ye may be sincere and without offence;"[1] in other words, that ye may *love Peace.*

And this, my Brethren, is the great twofold commandment which we have all to learn and to obey, not only separately in our individual capacity, but collectively as a Church. It was thus, at the beginning of the Gospel, with the Apostles and first disciples of Christianity. They had to establish,—they had to establish, in a world of discord, the great principle, "Love Peace;" but first, in a world of error, they had to establish the still greater principle, "Love the Truth." It was through the Truth that Peace was to be sought, and not, conversely, the Truth through Peace. And the enterprise they were engaged in would have been utterly hopeless unless they had been assisted in many marvellous ways, both visibly and audibly, by the power of God. It would have been utterly hopeless, both on other accounts, and by reason of the innumerable and infinitely diversi-

[1] Phil. i. 9, 10.

fied forms of error with which they had to contend. Looking to the record of the New Testament, we see how the matter stood from the very first. No sooner had the little band of followers of the Truth received from their Divine Master the command to "go and preach the Gospel to every creature"—no sooner had this command been given, than the Prince of Discord and Untruth summoned his own forces to the field. Not only was the Gospel battle to be fought with the undigested mass of popular Heathenism which everywhere prevailed, and with the discordant schools of philosophical unbelief which flourished in the metropolis and other chief cities of the Roman Empire, but God's own Revelation of the elder Covenant was made to assume an attitude of hostility, of the most determined and rancorous hostility, to His more perfect message of Redemption and Grace; and even among the Preachers of the Gospel itself there arose "men speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them."[1] Nay, it may be said, that at no period in the history of the Church have there been found Teachers of false doctrine more presumptuous or more corrupt than those which sprang up in the very earliest age, and ventured to oppose and to defy even the chiefest of the Apostles. And what was the course which St. Paul, which St. Peter, which St. John, which St. James, which St. Jude pursued and taught in regard to such? Did they teach their disciples to be indifferent to the Truth? Did they hold that, among

[1] Acts xx. 30.

so many varieties of opinion, error was unavoidable, unity was impossible; and, this being so, that dissensions and separations were to be esteemed of small account? Far from it; they foresaw indeed, and anticipated such results, from the craft and subtlety of our great enemy, and the corruption of our fallen nature; but they did not denounce them the less earnestly because they were to be expected. Not only did they teach that the Truth was possible to be ascertained, and Peace and Unity possible to be kept, but they regarded these things as duties, the fulfilment of which they enjoined on all men, and the violation of which they reprimanded and condemned, as irreconcilable with our Christian calling, and as fatal to our Christian hopes. In a word, they exhibited and urged the commandment of the text in every form and variety of speech, but never so as to lead us to suppose that where the Truth is not, Peace can be really and lastingly secured.

And so, at the era of the Reformation, the restorers of His word, and the purifiers of His Church, whom God raised up in this and other countries of Europe —these men had again to establish, if it might be, the same great principles, "Love the Truth and Peace." And if they succeeded in their glorious enterprise still less perfectly than the Apostles had done; if of the Truth they recovered not altogether, at least in some quarters, that full and perfect pattern which the Apostles taught; and if for Peace, in still greater measure, we have yet to seek:—let us remember, in their defence, that no direct interfer-

ence of supernatural aid was vouchsafed in their behalf; that in a conflict, the difficulties of which it is scarcely possible to over-estimate, they had no inspired guidance on which they could depend, no miraculous agency to which they could appeal, and by which they might assure both themselves and others that they were struggling in the cause of God.[1] That God was with them in much that they did, and *more that they desired to do*, we need not, we cannot doubt. That they were instruments in His hands to inflict punishment upon Church authorities which had justly forfeited His favour and protection, I am well convinced. That the chief of those to whom I now refer did love the Truth, love it fervently, love it for its own sake, love it so that they were prepared to surrender all things, even Peace itself, rather than not obtain it, no one, I think, will venture to deny, who has studied the authentic records of that important period with strict impartiality, and with the diligence and attention which they so eminently deserve.

The prime evidence which the Reformers gave of their devotion to the Truth was *the supremacy which they ascribed at all times to the Word of God.* They knew that fifteen centuries had elapsed since the Gospel was first preached; and further, they knew that, subject as everything in this world is to change and to decay, nothing but continual recurrence to an

[1] It is scarcely necessary to notice the spirit of Prophecy attributed both to Wishart and Knox. See Row's *History*, p. 9-11. Calderwood, I. 186. M'Crie's *Life of Knox*, p. 291.

unchangeable standard can secure men from falling into dangerous errors both of faith and life. God has given such a standard in His written Word, but partly through ignorance, partly through design, it had been withdrawn from sight. And the consequences were such as might have been anticipated. An age of darkness and superstition had intervened, similar to that of which we hear in the History of the Jews, when the reading of God's law had ceased from among the people. In proportion to the ignorance of the Law had been the idolatry and corruption which had overspread the land. But when the sacred Volume, which had been lost, was discovered[1] and brought to light, the consciences of many were struck with a sense of guilt, and a Reformation ensued. Happily there was then a king upon the throne—the young King Josiah—"whose heart was tender," so that when he heard the words of the Law, he humbled himself before God and rent his clothes and wept."[2] Happily, too, there was then a man in the office of High Priest, I mean Hilkiah, who did not attempt to hide the book which he had found, nor to oppose the measures which were necessary in order to bring back the nation to the standard of God's law. And so it was in England at the time of the Reformation. They had a Sovereign the very counterpart of good Josiah, in the young King Edward VI.; they had a Prelate, the counterpart of the loyal and devoted Hilkiah, in the Arch-

[1] 2 Kings xxii. 8; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 15.

[2] 2 Chron. xxxiv. 27; 2 Kings xxii. 19.

bishop Cranmer, who then occupied the see of Canterbury. But it was not so, unhappily, in this country. The Sovereign who should have led the movement, and the Archbishop who should have been prepared to guide and assist it in its course, arrayed themselves against it. Yes; and thus it was left to Knox and his associates to make known those deeply-needed lessons of a purer faith, which the Primate and his brethren should have been the first to teach, but which they were determined by all means, righteous or unrighteous, to stifle and suppress.

Meanwhile, the appeal, as I have said, on the part of our Reformers, was to the *Word of God.*[1] In that beautiful and affecting *Letter of wholesome Counsel*, which Knox wrote [1556] when for a season he was about to leave those among whom he had laboured in this country, he showed the value which he attached to the Holy Scriptures, not only as the sole authority in matters of faith, but as the most needful and effectual instrument of a godly life :—

"To you, dear Brethren, I write my knowledge, and do speak my conscience, that, so necessary as the use of meat and drink is to the preservation of life corporal, and so necessary as the heat and brightness of the sun is to the quickening of herbs and to expel darkness; so necessary is also for the life everlasting, and to the illumination and light of the soul, the perpetual meditation, exercise, and use of God's Holy Word. And therefore, dear Brethren, if that

[1] See *Proofs and Illustrations*, chap. i. p. 49-51.

ye look for a life to come, of necessity it is that ye exercise yourselves in the Book of the Lord your God. Let no day slip or want (without) some comfort from the mouth of God. Open your ears and He will speak even pleasant things to your heart. Close not your eyes, but diligently let them behold what portion of substance is left to you within your Father's Testament."[1]

Noble, heart-stirring words! Such was the testimony which our Reformers gave of the love which they bare to the Truth. But how was love for the truth shown upon the other side? For many years the Clergy had been wont not only to *discourage, but to forbid to the Laity the reading of Holy Scripture*;[2] and when in 1542 an Act of Parliament was proposed and afterwards passed, to authorize the use of the Old and New Testaments in the Vulgar tongue among all the subjects of this realm, the Archbishop of Glasgow, Chancellor of the Kingdom (Cardinal Beaton, Archbishop of St. Andrews, being then in prison) did what he could to oppose the measure; dissenting not only for himself, but in the name of all the other Prelates who were present, and "craving delay until a Provincial Council might be had of all the Clergy to advise and conclude thereon."[3] And afterwards, when such Councils *were* held, first

[1] Knox's *Works*, IV. 136.

[2] See *Proofs and Illustrations*, chap. i. pp. 51-53.

[3] See Knox's *History*, I. 98, *seq.* Keith, I. 89, *seq.* The Act which passed specifies both the Old and New Testaments. The Proclamation afterwards issued by order of the Regent (Earl of Arran) mentions only the New. See the late Principal Lee's *Lectures*, I. 80, *seq.*

in 1549, again in 1551, and lastly in 1559, the wish of the Reformers for the performance of Divine Service, including the Reading of Scripture, in the vulgar tongue, was not only not complied with, but obstinately refused. Thus they endeavoured to foreclose the way which alone could lead to discovery of the Truth; and by so doing they gave but too good ground for the presumption that the Truth, when known, would be seen to be against them.[1]

And so, for the most part, it was seen. On all the higher points of controversy that arose, the answer which the Bible gave spoke plainly in behalf of the Reformers. The supreme, universal authority and infallibility of the Bishop of Rome, upon which the whole then-existing system was made to rest, was found not only to have no sufficient support in the Word of God, but to be irreconcilable with many of its express statements, and subversive of the Constitution which the Apostles had ordained and instituted in the Church. Well might they declare, as was set forth by the Lords of the Congregation in 1559, "Now the question is not of the slaughter of one Cardinal," in allusion to the assassination of Cardinal Beaton, "but of the just abolishing of all that tyranny which that Roman Antichrist has usurped above us."[2] In like manner they proceeded to bring to the light of Scripture, and, guided by that light, to condemn, the traditional teaching by which the great fundamental doctrine of our Justification

[1] See Knox's *Letter to the Commonalty of Scotland*, in 1558; *Works*, IV. 525.

[2] Knox's *History*, I. 430.

through the one atoning and all-sufficient Sacrifice once made upon the Cross, had been corrupted and overlaid. They saw that the very Rulers, even the boasted successors of St. Peter (as we know was the case with St. Peter himself on one occasion) "walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel."[1] They would not allow that righteousness should be supposed to come any otherwise than it had come to Abraham, *i.e.*, by faith in the Son of God. They vindicated the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper from the superstition and idolatry with which it was profaned. They restored the Cup to the Laity. They won back for the Clergy the lawfulness of a married life. They repudiated the doctrine of Purgatory, and the practice of prayer to any other but God alone. They claimed the free use of the Holy Scriptures; and that the worship of God, and especially the administration of the Sacraments, should be performed in the vulgar tongue.

In a word, to use their own language, their whole purpose and intent was, that "Christ's Religion should be restored to the original purity."[2] But there was little disposition on the part of the supreme powers, either in Church or State, to concur in such a design; nor, indeed, so long as they were determined to uphold the authority and infallibility of the Pope, was it possible for them to concur in it.

[1] Gal. ii. 14.

[2] See *First Oration of the Protestants of Scotland to the Queen Regent*, 1558. Knox's *History*, I. 306; II. 264; also the Protestation made in Parliament the same year. "We protest that these our requests . . . do tend to no other end but to *the Reformation of abuses in Religion* only." *Ibid.* I. 314.

And thus the grand issue was again raised; the same which the Apostles had raised when they were threatened by the Jewish Council, and "commanded not to speak at all, nor teach in the name of Jesus:"[1]—the grand issue, whether of the two was to be obeyed—God or Man?

To this solemn question there could be but one answer on the part of those who loved the Truth. And yet the case was not so simple as it might seem at first, and as some, perhaps, would seek to represent it. True, the Word of God forbade the erroneous doctrines which the enemies of the Reformation were determined to uphold. But it also forbade the resistance of constituted authorities. It forbade insubordination. Yes, we must not forget the solemn injunction of our Lord Himself, which was given in behalf even of the Scribes and Pharisees, whom He had so often denounced as the enemies both of God and man:—"The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat, all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do."[2] And there can be no doubt that our Reformers did recognise (as they were bound to do) this obligation; they did feel the constraint under which they were laid in this respect. Hear the words of Knox addressed, in December 1557, *To*

[1] Acts iv. 18, 19. Compare George Wishart, in Knox's *History*, I. 156.

[2] Matt. xxiii. 2, 3. For the limitations with which this text is to be understood, see Leslie's *Discourse of Private Judgment and Authority in matters of Faith*. *Works*, I. 400, *seq.* There is an unhappy passage in the *Confession of Faith*, c. xviii. which appears to be contrary to our Lord's own words in the above text, and at the same time inconsistent with another passage of the same *Confession*, c. xxv. See also Knox's *Works*, IV. 266.

the Lords and others professing the truth in Scotland:—"My conscience will not suffer me to keep back from you my counsel, yea my judgment and commandment, which I communicate with you in God's fear, and with the assurance of His truth, which is, that none of you that seek to promote the glory of Christ, do suddenly disobey or displease the established authority in things lawful; neither yet that ye assist or fortify such as, for their own particular cause and worldly promotion, would trouble the same."[1]

Do we inquire, then, how our Reformers reconciled the twofold obligation thus laid upon them? I answer—

1. First, they reconciled it by considering *the precedence which is due to love of the Truth.* God has commanded us to love and obey our Parents. But He has also said, "He that loveth Father or Mother more than Me is not worthy of Me."

When God claims our obedience directly for Himself, all lower claims of duty, though founded upon His own word, are required to give place. This was the meaning of the Apostles' answer when they said, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye."[1] They did not doubt that it was their duty, in all ordinary cases, to obey those whom God had set over them. But this was no ordinary case. Christ Himself had commanded them, plainly and expressly, to "go and preach the Gospel to every creature." And if any

[1] Knox's *Works*, iv. 284. [1] Acts iv. 19.

one, however high in office and authority over them, should presume to gainsay Christ's command, they rightly judged that in this particular such an one was not to be obeyed. Thus they asserted the principle, that every Christian is bound, not only to search the Scriptures for himself, but to exercise his own reason, to use his own judgment, as the ultimate resource, in order to determine the path which he ought to take in reference to all matters of religious duty. I do not say that, upon every case of a pretended conscientious scruple, we are at liberty to plead the will of God. "Conscience, Madam," said Knox in his first conference with Queen Mary, "Conscience, Madam, *requires knowledge.*"[1] No; the matter in question must be *plain and manifest*, in proportion as the responsibility of disobedience to lawful authority is great and fearful. And the Reformers had such a case. They could plead, in some particulars at least, the will and the word of God, with no less certainty than the Apostles pleaded it, when they refused to obey the command of their ungodly Rulers, "to preach no more in the name of Jesus."

2. Again, in the strait to which our Reformers were reduced, they would bear in mind the case which the Bible itself contemplates, as an exception to the law of Peace. "*If it be possible*, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men."[2] With opposition such as they had to encounter, Peace was not possible. To remain passive, was to make not

[1] Knox's *Works*, II. 284. [2] Rom. xii. 18.

only "themselves," but THE TRUTH, "a prey."[1] Early in the struggle (1540-41) an Act was passed which forbade all discussion on matters of Religion, and especially all argument against the Pope's authority, under pain of death and confiscation of goods.[2] What was said (in 1554) regarding England, was unhappily but too true also of this country, viz., that "most part of those who first blew the Lord's trumpet, gave their blood in a testimony that their doctrine was the same, which by blood was planted, by blood was kept in mind, and by blood did increase and fructify."[3] And therefore, it was not without reason that the great Leader of our Reformation, to his former counsel and command of obedience in all things lawful, added words like these: "In the bowels of Christ Jesus I exhort you, that with all simplicity and lawful obedience, *joined with boldness in God, and with open confession of your faith,* ye seek the favours of the Authority, that by it (if possible be) the cause in which ye labour may be promoted, *or at the least not persecuted;* which thing, after all humble request, if ye cannot obtain, then, with open and solemn protestation of your obedience to be given to the Authority in all things not *plainly repugning* to God, ye lawfully may attempt the extremity; which is, to provide (whether the Authority will consent or no) that Christ's Gospel may be truly preached, and His Holy Sacraments rightly ministered, unto you and to your brethren, the subjects

[1] Is. lix. 15.

[2] See *Proofs and Illustrations*, chap. i. p. 52, *seq.*

[3] Knox's *Godly Letter to the Faithful in London*, Works, III. 205.

of this realm. And further, ye lawfully may, yea, and thereto are bound, to defend your Brethren from persecution and tyranny, be it against Princes or Emperors, to the uttermost of your power; providing always, as I have said, that neither ye yourselves deny *lawful obedience*, neither yet that ye assist nor promote those that seek authority and pre-eminence out of worldly glory, yea, for the oppression and destruction of others."[1]

But when terms like these could not be obtained; when the authorities of the Church, supported more or less by the civil power, were determined to maintain their cause by "fire and sword;"[2] when, in 1556, the sentence of death had been pronounced, in his absence, against Knox himself, and he had been burnt in effigy and excommunicated;[3] when, on the one hand, the chains of Papal usurpation and of Papal doctrine had been riveted afresh by the

[1] Knox's *Works*, IV. 285. See also Ballinger's *Answers*, *Ibid.* III. 224.

[2] See *First Oration of Protestants to Queen Regent.*—"Your Grace cannot be ignorant . . . how the Clergy usurp to themselves such empire above the consciences of men, that whatsoever they command must be obeyed, and whatsoever they forbid must be avoided, without further respect had to God's pleasure, commandment, or will revealed to us in His most Holy Word; or else there abideth nothing for us but *faggot, fire, and sword;* by the which many of our brethren most cruelly and most unjustly have been stricken of late years within this realm." Knox's *History*, I. 302 and 330. Knox's *Appellation to the Nobility.* "The Religion, which amongst you is maintained by *fire and sword.*" Works, IV. 519. *Letter to the Commonalty.* "That Religion, which amongst you is this day defended by *fire and sword.*" *Ibid.* pp. 523-533. It is sufficient to refer to the case of Walter Miln, called by Archbishop Spottiswoode "the last of the martyrs," who suffered in April 1558, being in his 82d year. *See* Spottiswoode, I. 191; Tytler's *History*, VI. 102. A list of Scottish Martyrs is given by M'Crie, Note H.

[3] See Knox's *Works*, I. 254; IV. 468. The cowardice shown by the Ecclesiastical authorities in the case of Knox seems to have been equal to their cruelty in the case of Miln.

Canons of the Provincial Council which met in Edinburgh, 1559;[1] and when, on the other hand, the whole body of the Reforming ministers were pronounced outlaws by the Queen Regent;[2] then, not without cause, began to be raised the further question, whether the authority, whose lawful commands they had been prepared to obey, was in itself *legitimate;* a question which, on the part of the unreforming Clergy, it was the height of infatuation to provoke. It was, I say, the height of infatuation on the part of the Clergy to provoke this question, because the obedience which they claimed, and the authority which they exercised, were liable to exception upon two accounts. First, over and above the accusations brought against them upon the ground of the idolatrous worship which they practised, and the false doctrines which they taught, a large proportion of them, and not least those in the highest rank, had virtually forfeited their office and jurisdiction by the notorious ungodliness in which they lived;[3] while yet, as the law then stood, however heinous their offences, however scandalous their lives, it was not possible for the civil magistrate to call them to account.[4] And secondly, it could not but

[1] See *Proofs and Illustrations*, chap. ii. p. 63, *seq.*

[2] See Knox's *History*, I. 319.

[3] It is sufficient to produce their own confession. The Preamble of the Acts of the Provincial Council held in 1549, assigns two principal causes, "malorum quæ tantas nobis turbas *hæresium-que occasiones* excitavere," namely, "in Personis Ecclesiasticis omnium fere graduum *morum corruptela ac vitæ profana obscenitas*, tum bonarum literarum artium que crassa ignorantia."—Wilkins' *Concilia*, iv. 46 (quoted by Lord Hailes). See also Canon 44 and Canon 9 of the same Council.—*Ibid.* p. 49.

[4] On the claim of the Clergy to be exempt from Civil Jurisdiction, see Knox's *Appellation to Nobility*.—Works, iv. 508, *seq.*

tend to reconcile the Reformers to the painful struggle which was now become unavoidable, when they considered that the authority against which they strove, so far as it depended upon the Church of Rome for its sanction and support, had *no proper claim to their obedience.* It was founded upon usurpation on the one side, and upon an unjustifiable surrender of national rights and liberties on the other. This, therefore, was a contest which concerned them not only as Churchmen and as Christians, but as citizens, as patriots, as Scotsmen.

And now, let us observe how, in entering upon the contest, they took for their position the very ground which their adversaries had challenged them to occupy, and from which, when they had occupied it, it was not possible to dislodge them. They appealed not only to the authority of Scripture, but to the ancient testimonies of the Church itself. Thus, in their *First Petition to the Queen Regent,* in 1558, "We are content," they said, "not only that the precepts and rules of the New Testament, but also *the writings of the ancient Fathers, and the godly approved laws of Justinian the Emperor, decide the contest between us and them.*"[1] And again, in the *Appeal* made in the same year by Knox to the Nobility, "from the cruel and most unjust sentence pronounced against him by the false Bishops and Clergy of Scotland," he thus writes :—"Let God, I say, speak by His law, by His Prophets, by Christ Jesus, or by His Apostles, and so let Him pronounce what religion He approveth;

[1] Knox's *History,* I. 305.

and then, be my enemies never so many, and appear they never so strong and so learned, no more do I fear victory than did Helias, being but one man against the multitude of Baal's Priests. And if they (*i.e.*, his opponents) think to have advantage by their Councils and Doctors, *this I further offer, to admit the one and the other as witnesses in all matters debatable;* these things (which justly cannot be denied) being granted unto me :—*First*, that *the most ancient Councils nighest to the Primitive Church in which the learned and godly Fathers did examine all matters by God's Word, may be holden of most authority.*" (Observe, my brethren, our great Reformer does not teach us to regard either the ancient Councils of the Church, or the ancient Fathers, with contempt, but refers to them as witnesses, whom in all matters of controversy we are bound to respect.) "*Secondarily*," he proceeds, "that no determination of Councils, nor man, be admitted against the determination of those *four chief Councils*, whose authority hath been and is holden by them equal with the authority of the four Evangelists. And last, that to no Doctor be given greater authority than Augustine requireth to be given to his writings; to wit, if he plainly prove not his affirmation by God's infallible Word, then that his sentence be rejected and imputed to the error of a man. These things granted and admitted, *I shall no more refuse the testimonies of Councils and Doctors than shall my Adversaries.*"[1]

Such were the sound and charitable principles,

[1] Knox's *Works*, iv. 518, *seq.*

such the broad and all-sufficient basis, upon which our Scottish Reformers originally took their stand. They were no other than those upon which the Reformation in England was undertaken and carried through. Would to God that the same work of Reformation in this country, as it was undertaken, so it had been followed up and completed on the same basis, the same principles!

Our Reformers, brethren, as we have seen, did not decline the testimony of the Primitive Church. Provided that testimony were not repugnant to the Word of God, they were willing to receive it; nay, they appealed to it to decide between themselves and their opponents, whether of the two could more justly claim the true interpretation and support of God's Word.

Thus they submitted themselves to the law not only of the love of the Truth, but of the love of Peace. It was, however—alas! that we must say so—it was in profession only.[1] Under the pressure of a crisis, than which, as I before said, it is scarcely possible to conceive any more difficult and perplexing, or more fearful, they were tempted to forget or disregard the test which they had themselves allowed. No one, who is a competent judge of such questions, will now venture to affirm that *Church government by Bishops* (as distinct from the usurpations of Popery) is repugnant to the Word of God. And where is there a Council or a Doctor of the ancient Church who does not bear witness to the same government, as truly and legitimately deduced from

[1] See *Proofs and Illustrations,* chap. iii. pp. 73-94.

the right interpretation of that Word? No one will now affirm that the Ordinance of *Confirmation*, or the practice of *Liturgical worship*, is repugnant to the Word of God; and where, I ask again, where is there to be found a Council or a Doctor of the Primitive Church who does not regard these observances as edifying in themselves, and conformable to the inspired Word? No one who has any knowledge of the "godly and approved laws of the Emperor Justinian,"[1] to which, as you have heard, our Reformers appealed only two years before their Confession of Faith and Book of Discipline were drawn up;—no one who knows anything whatever of those Four chief Councils of the Universal Church, in which, to use the words of Knox, written in the same year, "the learned and godly Fathers did examine all matters by God's Word," will doubt for a moment that, while those authorities would have been found to condemn the Papal system, they would equally have disallowed the course which Knox and his associates, when they had the power to establish their own system, were satisfied to adopt.[2] And therefore, I say that our Reformers, when, from whatever cause, they allowed themselves

[1] See *Proofs and Illustrations*, p. 89, note 1.

[2] See, *e.g.*, Canons 6 and 7 of the first of "those Four Councils," A.D. 325; upon which Hooker remarks: "In the *Nicene Council* there are confirmed certain prerogatives and dignities belonging unto Primates or Archbishops; and of them it is said, that the *Ancient Custom of the Church* had been to give them such pre-eminence; but no syllable whereby any man should conjecture that those Fathers did honour the superiority which Bishops have over other Pastors *only* upon ancient custom, and *not* as a true Apostolical, heavenly, and Divine ordinance."—*Eccl. Pol.* Book vii. ch. xi. 7.

first to gainsay the necessity of *Ordination*, and then to place it upon a footing which the Church from the beginning had never known ;[1] when they abandoned *Episcopacy ;* when, Episcopacy being abandoned, they suffered *Confirmation*, though a scriptural ordinance, to "fall to the ground ;" when they abandoned the Congregational use of forms of worship,[2] and of Confessions of Faith ; when they abandoned these things, they did in fact abandon the broad and catholic basis upon which they had professed to take their stand. And further, I must add, that when, in order to make short work[3] with the superstitious ceremonies and overgrown ritual of their opponents, they laid down, all too rigidly, the prin-

[1] See *Book of Discipline*, chap. iv. 3. "Albeit the Apostles used *Imposition of Hands*, yet, seeing the miracle is ceased, the using of the ceremony *we judge not necessary ;*" and in chap. vi. iii. 9, "*we cannot allow.*" See also chap. xvi. 3. Laying on of hands was restored in 1578.

[2] The Genevan *Book of Common Order* was not *formally* adopted till 1564 ; but after full examination of the question, I am inclined to agree with the late Dr. Lee (*Lectures*, I. 160), and Dr. Tulloch, p. 377, that the above-named Book, and not the English *Book of Common Prayer* is intended to be referred to in the *Book of Discipline*, if not in the *Heads concerning Religion* agreed upon in 1558. See Knox's *History*, I. 275, and editor's note ; Calderwood, I. 328 ; Keith, I. 155 ; Cook, II. 36 ; M'Crie, pp. 112, 354-57 ; Tytler's *History*, VI. 99, 136, 138 ; Cunningham, I. 362 ; Lorimer, p. 261 ; Cumming's *Liturgy of Church of Scotland*, p. iv. The *Book of Common Order* did not restrict the minister to the use of the very words of the Prayers, and therefore, was preparing the way for its own abrogation. Hardwick's *Reformation*, p. 153.

[3] This was the common source of Knox's mistakes. Provided an argument or a stratagem that came to hand gave him an immediate advantage, he did not sufficiently consider ulterior consequences. Thus Aylmer objects to him, with regard to his *Blast against the Regiment of Women*, that "his error rose not of malice, but of *zeal*, and by looking more to the present cruelty that then [under Queen Mary] was used, than to *the inconvenience that after might follow.*" — Strype's *Life of Aylmer*, p. 153. See below, p. 121 ; Tytler, VI. 406, admits that he was "unscrupulous as to means ;" and M'Crie, p. 42, that "his motto was, *to spare no arrows.*"

ciple that nothing is to be admitted in the Public worship of God, for which we cannot produce the express warrant of His own Word;[1] when, I say, having rashly asserted, they obstinately contended for this principle, in all its nakedness and all its breadth, they committed themselves and their cause to a position, which (as we now find) the voice even of an enlightened and consistent common sense will not sustain. For example, weighed in the balances of the *Book of Discipline*, which abolished the observance of Christmas and other Festivals instituted to the honour of our Lord Himself,[2] the celebration which is now kept in honour of the Reformers must much more be regarded as forbidden by themselves. How painfully less defensible the movement afterwards became, when rites and ceremonies, which at first had been needlessly or mistakenly objected to, as not authorized by Scripture, were in course of time denounced as diabolical, as anti-Scriptural, and anti-Christian, I forbear to mention, nor indeed is it necessary in a just retrospect of the period which we now commemorate.[3]

And whence, then, arose the error into which our Reformers fell?

First, it arose out of *the perplexing and inveterate character of the corruptions of the system which they*

[1] See *Proofs and Illustrations*, chap. iv. pp. 95-98.

[2] In the *Book of Discipline*, chap. i. 2, and again, in the *Short Summary* of that Book, 31, we find these Festivals classed among "abominations," the maintainers of which "should be punished with the civil sword." The observance of Holydays was retained by the Lutherans, and also by Calvin at Geneva, and in other Swiss Churches. See Knox's *Hist.* II. 534; M'Crie, p. 50, note.

[3] But see *Proofs and Illustrations*, chap. v. p. 97, *seq.*

had to reform.[1] It arose out of the fact, that all these things which I have mentioned—Diocesan Episcopacy, Confirmation, Ordination, Liturgical worship—had been not only grievously abused for centuries, under the Papal system, but the true use and origin of them as Divine or Apostolical Ordinances, had been greatly obscured, if not altogether lost. It has been justly said, that, "whosoever would write the true history of Presbyterianism, must begin at Rome and not at Geneva."[2] And why? Because it had been the policy of the Popes to destroy the independent authority of the local Bishops, and this they had contrived to effect in various ways. They began by denying their title to be regarded as a distinct Order in the Church. Though the Romish Church has *seven* Orders, *the Episcopate*, be it remembered, *is not one of them.* They then proceeded to dispense with the exercise of their office in many instances, and committed the performance of Episcopal acts to men who were not Bishops. Thus they prepared the way for the introduction of a system, which should be first *non-Episcopal* and then *anti-Episcopal.* It was asked and answered two centuries ago: "Who did first invest Presbyters with Episcopal jurisdiction, and the power of Ordaining and Confirming, but the Court of Rome by their Commissions and Delegations for avaricious ends? . . . These avaricious practices of that Court (though it be not commonly observed) were the first source of the present con-

[1] See *Proofs and Illustrations*, chap. vi. pp. 127-142.

[2] Leslie's *Discourse on Qualifications requisite to administer the Sacraments*, *Works*, VII. 127.

troversies about Episcopacy and Ecclesiastical Discipline, which do now so much disturb the Peace of the Church."[1] And again, what was it that opened the pulpits, often in unlicensed and irregular ways, which would not be possible at the present day, to the preaching of the Reformers? It was the indolence and ignorance of the Instituted Clergy, which had previously called in the assistance of the preaching Friars. Thus, by a righteous judgment, the usurpation which the Popes had practised towards others, and the sloth and self-indulgence to which the Clergy of all orders had given way, were made to recoil upon their own heads.

But the error of our Reformers, it must not be denied, was due also in part to another cause. They were misled, not only by the evil influences under which they had been born, and in the midst of which they had so long lived, but by the overweening confidence which they were disposed to place in themselves, and especially in their great Leader. Eager and enthusiastic, but self-willed and undisciplined in their zeal and love for the Truth, they too much overlooked what is due to the love of Peace, which is indeed an essential portion of the Truth. It has been made a matter of pride and boasting in their behalf that, in the preparation of their *Book of Discipline*, the Reforming Ministers "took not their pattern from any Kirk in the world, no, not from Geneva itself, but laying God's Word before them, made Reformation according there-

[1] Bramhall's *Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon*— *Works*, II. 71.

unto."[1] And when the work, thus done, was submitted to the judgment of the "Great Council," they claimed of them "to repudiate nothing which they were not able to improve (disprove) by God's written and revealed Word."[2] That is, they threw upon this body the responsibility of interpreting God's Word in regard to those points on which they themselves had departed from the example of every Church in the world, and trusted only to their own understanding of Holy Writ. Surely, my brethren, to proceed thus was not consistent with the due love of Peace and Unity; of Peace and Unity which they were bound to keep, *in all things lawful*, with the fifteen centuries of Christians who had lived before them—among whom, be it remembered, were their own forefathers—and with their Christian brethren then living throughout the world—among whom, be it remembered, were men who, though their opponents, were still fellow-countrymen.[3] Nay, it was

[1] Row's *History*, p. 12, quoted by Dr. Lorimer in his elegant and genial *Historical Sketch*, p. 253; M'Crie's *Life of Knox*, p. 50, 165. Compare the boast in Knox's *History*, II. 264.

It must be remembered that no attempt is made in this *Book of Discipline* to defend a *non-Episcopal* system. See below, p. 28, and note 3.

On the *Imparity* between the *Superintendents* and *Ministers*, see Bishop Sage, *Works*, I. 181-195. Dr. Lee (*Lectures*, I. 159, 169) objects to Bishop Sage's argument, that "the system of Superintendents was only a temporary expedient." This may be true; but it may be urged both ways. Is there any sufficient proof that the authors of the *Book of Discipline* contemplated *eventually* a downward rather than an upward movement? See Cook, II. 379, 384.

[2] Knox's *History*, II. 154.

[3] The following are the words of Hooker, who died A.D. 1600: "A thousand five hundred years and upward the Church of Christ hath now continued under the sacred regiment of Bishops. Neither *for so long* hath Christianity been *ever planted in any kingdom*, but with this kind of government alone."—*Ecc. Pol.* Book vii. ch. i. 4.

not consistent with the first and simplest precepts of that revealed Word which they professed to follow, as set forth, not only in our text, but, I may say, *throughout* the Old and New Testament; precepts which command us to shun all uncharitableness, all pride, and arrogance, and self-sufficiency; precepts, too, which they had virtually professed to regard, when they had declared themselves not unwilling to take counsel of other judgments besides their own, and especially of the godly and learned of the Primitive Church. Nor can it, I fear, be maintained in their defence, that the difficulties which surrounded them, however great, afforded a sufficient justification for the course they took. On the contrary, the events of 1560, the all but unanimous reception of the *Confession of Faith* by the Three Estates of Parliament, and the unanimous passing of the *Act* which immediately followed *for abolishing the Jurisdiction of the Pope;*—these events are enough to show that a larger share of moderation, of patience, and forbearance, was alone required in order to carry out our Reformation upon a plan, not such as should make the Church of Scotland like no other Church in the world, but such as should bring it into agreement not only with the Reformed Sister Church in England, but with all the Churches of Christendom in the Primitive and purest ages, when Popery and Presbyterianism were alike unknown.

After all, we must admit, it is not easy to determine how much of the error and inconsistency which we notice in the Reformers' course, was due to the

pressure or temptation of circumstances, and how much to actual conviction and their own deliberate choice. That Knox himself was not ill pleased to see a change carried further than that which had taken place in England, there can be little doubt. Of this, his conduct at Frankfort (1555) is perhaps a sufficient proof.[1] At the same time, we must remember the counsel and admonition which he received, not only from the holy Bishop Ridley, just before his martyrdom, but from Calvin also, on that account. The former, deploring his captious and innovating spirit, asked why he will not follow "the sentence of the old ancient writers," adding "from whom to dissent I cannot think it any godly wisdom."[2] The latter wrote to him in 1561: "I trust that you will moderate your rigour in regard to ceremonies. . . . You know that we must bear with some things of which we may not altogether approve."[3] But, at all events, *the facts themselves remain as they were.* It remains, that Knox and our Reformers, in two several and most important documents, declarative of their views and principles as entertained in 1558, appealed to the Judgment of Primitive Antiquity. It remains that in January 1559, Knox, in his *Exhortation to England,* when professing to reduce the Reformation there to

[1] See *Proofs and Illustrations,* chap. v. p. 116. I have said "perhaps," because the origin of the troubles at Frankfort was of a mixed character, and Knox, especially, had reason to be influenced by mixed motives.

[2] Letter to Grindal, in Strype's *Life of Grindal,* p. 29. There can be no doubt that the contents of the letter would be communicated to Knox. See also Knox's *Works,* iv. 61.

[3] See Calvin, *Epist. et Resp.* p. 328, "quædam etsi minus probentur, toleranda esse non ignoras."

the exact "rule and line" of God's Word, did not recommend the extinction of Episcopacy, but a subdivision of the Bishoprics, as being too cumbrous and extensive for the charge of one man.[1] It remains, that in the same year (1559), our Reformers presented to the Queen-Regent, and (through her) to the Provincial Council, then sitting, four preliminary Articles of Reformation, in one of which they proposed "that in time coming Bishops be admitted with the assent of the Barons of the Diocese."[2] It remains, that the *Confession of Faith* and *Book of Discipline*, 1560, though they take no account of Episcopacy or of Confirmation, do not disavow them,[3] do not denounce them. It remains that, in 1564, three Commissioners, of whom Knox was one, in a letter which they wrote, by order of the General Assembly, to the then Archbishops of Canterbury and York (Parker and Young) subscribed themselves as "Your *loving Brethren* in Christ Jesus, and Fellow Servants in His Holy Evangile."[4] It remains, that again, in 1566, the General Assembly, under Knox's guidance, and in his own words, addressed "the Bishops of God's Church in England" as "*Brethren*, who possessed with them the *truth of Jesus Christ*."[5] And, on the other hand, if they *did* embrace this new system as a whole, purely from deliberate choice, and from their own private inter-

[1] See *Proofs and Illustrations*, chap. v. p. 125.

[2] See *Proofs and Illustrations*, chap. ii. p. 62.

[3] It was, in fact, an *afterthought*, which did not occur to our first Reformers, to defend a non-Episcopal system from Scripture. See above, p. 25, note 1.

[4] See *Parker Correspondence*, P. Soc. pp. 205-7. Strype's *Life of Parker*, I. 297.

[5] Knox's *History*, II. 545. See also *Ibid.* I. 382.

pretation of the written Word, then, it remains, that they were *singular;*—and singularity in divine things is tantamount to untruth :—then, we are sure that they read the Word of God differently not only from Primitive Antiquity, to which they had appealed, but from all other Churches of all ages ; from whence it may be presumed that they read it not correctly : then, we must conclude that their principles were in harmony neither with those of their English brethren, nor yet with those of the Continental Reformers, who confessed, again and again, that they had departed from the Polity of the Universal Church, not from choice or from conviction, but from the exigency of their position ; in other words, from *necessity alone.* Nothing is more certain than that both Luther and Calvin would gladly have retained Episcopal ordination, if they could have obtained it from Reforming Bishops.[1] And as regards Liturgical worship, in

[1] See *Augsburgh Confession* (1530), Pars ii. § 7. Hase, p. 44. Melanchthon, *Epist.* Lib. iv. 104, p. 684, and *Ibid.* 106, p. 686. *Apol. Confess.* § 7. Hase, p. 204. Seckendorf, *Historia Lutheranismi*, lib. ii. c. lxviii. p. 179. *Lutheri Opera*, VII. 184 ; VIII. 1-11. The ultimatum of Luther and the Divines of Wittemberg, as presented to the Elector of Saxony, Jan. 14, 1545, contains the following words :—"In short, *there is no other way to a holy concord but this :* that the Bishops should embrace the true doctrine of the gospel, and the right use of the sacraments, and that we should obey them as the governors of the Church, to which we pledge ourselves."—Seckendorf, *Hist. Luther*, II. 531. See also *Ibid.* p. 535. Luther's last publication was his *Commentary on Hosea*, in 1545, the year before his death. It contains the following remarkable words :—

"Let the Bishops cease to persecute and blaspheme the gospel ; let them provide for the Churches true Teachers ; let them put away forms of worship which are impious and idolatrous, and restore such as are pure and true ; and then *the duty which we owe to them* shall be fully paid ; then will we acknowledge them as our Parents indeed ; then we will gladly submit ourselves to their authority, WHICH WE SEE TO BE THOROUGHLY FORTIFIED BY THE WORD OF GOD (quam verbo Dei

some Protestant countries, I believe, it was never abolished; in many, I know, it is now restored.

Upon the great question of Toleration, it is not necessary to speak. It is too well known that the rights of conscience, which our Reformers claimed for themselves, they were not prepared, any more than their opponents, to grant freely to others. Though they could feel the utmost sympathy for the "tenderness of a scrupulous conscience" in a case where "surplice, corner cap, and tippet" were concerned,[1] they did not hesitate to denounce as *blasphemous* or *idolatrous* whatever was at variance with their own convictions.[2] And yet there was in this respect also, the widest difference between them and the enemies of Reformation, inasmuch as their intolerance was shown rather in word than in deed. It is recorded to their honour by a contemporary Historian, and a most unexceptionable witness (Bishop Lesley), that in those tumultuary scenes, amid all that popular heat, the humanity which they exercised was "remarkable;" the more remarkable, I may add, when we consider the cruel and bloodthirsty treatment which many of their own party had received. In a word, we are assured that "for the matter of Religion, they

videmus communitam").—*Luth. Op.* VIII. 591, *seq.* Seckendorf, II. 553.

That Calvin's opinions (irrespective of the exigency of his own position) agreed with this, is evident from his Tract, *De necessitate Reformandæ Ecclesiæ*, which contains the famous passage, "Talem nobis Hierarchiam si exhibeant, etc. etc., nullo non anathemate dignos fatear."—*Op.* VIII. 60, *seq.*, and his Letter to the King of Poland, Dec. 1554, *Ep. et Resp.* 187-191.

[1] See Knox's *History*, II. 545.

[2] It may suffice to quote one short sentence. "We are persuaded that *all* which our adversaries do, is *Diabolical*."—Knox, *Godly Letter to the Faithful*, etc. *Works*, III. 198.

visited few of their Adversaries with banishment, fewer with imprisonment, none with death."[1]

So far then, my Brethren, we have seen wherein the glory and the strength, and wherein the weakness of our Reformation lay. Its strength lay in its ardent love of the Truth—that love of the Truth which appealed fearlessly to the Word of God, and thereby proved that the distinguishing points of belief and practice, which the influence of the Church of Rome had introduced into this country, were erroneous and corrupt. Its weakness lay in the disregard which (from whatever cause) it showed to that second great principle of the Christian life, the love of Peace. In other words, it lay in those points wherein the appeal to the Word of God was misconducted, or pushed to an extent which not only the example of the universal Church, but natural feeling and common sense itself are sufficient to condemn.

And if this be so, while we acknowledge and thank God for the good which our Reformers did, we see, moreover, that which *they have left to us to do.* They have left to us to occupy the position which they wisely chose, but failed to maintain. They have left to us to *reconcile the love of the Truth with the love of Peace.*

I grant that if our Presbyterian Brethren object to the Threefold Ministry, object to Confirmation, object to Liturgical worship, object, in a word, to the Constitution of the Church which exists in England, as *repugnant to the Word of God,* so long as they remain

[1] Quoted by Burnet, *History of Reformation,* III. 540.

of this mind, they ought not to be expected to accept that Constitution. Love of the Truth, however mistaken, paramount as it is to the love of Peace, would forbid them so to act. And there was a time when, among a party of little or no learning, and infinitely small in comparison with the whole Body of Christians reformed and unreformed,—there was a time when, among that party, it was attempted to maintain such a view; when Prelacy, notwithstanding its universal and exclusive acceptance in the Church for fifteen centuries, was held by them to be *contrary* to the Word of God. But it is not so now. The utmost that is now maintained, at least by its ablest and most esteemed supporters, in favour of the Presbyterian system, upon those points wherein it differs from ours, is that that system is *not forbidden in God's Word*, and that *no other is prescribed*.[1]

Falling back upon the principle,—or rather, must I not say, the *assumption?*—of the first *Book of Discipline*, which extends to the polity of the Church what is doubtless true (within certain limits) of rites and ceremonies, they are content to hold that, as in states so also in the Church, no one Policy "can be appointed for all ages, times, and places."[2] I will not argue upon the point. I will not even urge that, if the visible Church be "one Body," then, to apply the words of Knox, "of one Body, there must be one law."[3] I will not urge what appears to us, that both

[1] See Hill's *Institutes*, p. 181. Principal Tulloch's *Leaders of Reformation*, p. 239.

[2] Chap. xx. See *Proofs and Illustrations*, Chap. iv. p. 99, *seq.*

[3] See *Godly Letter*. *Works*. III. 191.

the revealed Word and *the Providence of God* have placed a wide distinction between Civil and Ecclesiastical Government in *this*, as unquestionably they have done so, in *many other* respects. I will not urge the solemn words of the Church of England, as put forth by her in 1552, eight years before the *Book of Discipline* was drawn up :—" It is evident unto all men *diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors*, that from the Apostles' time there have been these three Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." I will not urge the logical Demonstration of our great common champion, Chillingworth (author of *The Religion of Protestants*), that the Church Polity which was (confessedly) universal in, or presently after, the Apostles' time, must be of Apostolic authority.[1] I will not urge, in confirmation of the same argument, that an eminent scholar, who is universally regarded as the most learned and trustworthy interpreter of ancient chronology, I mean the late Mr. Fynes Clinton, has actually registered the names and succession of Bishops, from the first century, not only at Jerusalem, but in each of the metropolitan cities of the three then known Divisions of the inhabited world—Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch—with no less certainty and precision than he has chronicled the lists of the Roman Consuls, or the Athenian Archons.[2] I will not

[1] Chillingworth's *Works*, III. 485-491. Compare Hill's *Institutes*, p. 166. It is to be regretted that our latest Church historian, and one so generally candid and trustworthy as Mr. Cunningham, has failed to do justice to this argument. Vol. I. p. 65. See *Proofs and Illustrations*, chap. iii. p. 83-89.

[2] See Clinton's *Fasti Romani*,

urge that the incidental notices of St. James the Less in Holy Scripture, *i.e.*, in the Acts and in two of St. Paul's Epistles, are utterly inexplicable,[1] and that the Epistles to Timothy and Titus are comparatively unmeaning, except upon the theory of a Diocesan Prelacy. I will not urge how the necessarily slow and gradual up-growth of such a Prelacy in the first period of the Church was strikingly illustrated, in the progress of our Reformation, by the fact that, after the lapse of more than thirty years from the commencement of the movement, the Reforming ministers, when they had newly subdivided the whole country into *ten* different Stations or Dioceses, and designed to provide a Superintendent for each, were unable to find more than *five* persons from among their Body willing and competent to be promoted to the office. I will not urge that Confirmation appears to be spoken of in the Word of God, viz., in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in immediate connexion with, and in its natural sequence after, Repentance, Faith, and Baptism, as one of the first and fundamental "principles of the doctrine of Christ." I will not urge that whereas extemporaneous worship is nowhere prescribed in Holy Scripture, an unchangeable form of words is expressly ordered to be *said, when we pray,* by our Lord himself.

No! I will not now argue upon these points with our Presbyterian Brethren; but, all controversy set aside, may we not appeal to their love of PEACE, their

[1] Upon this and the following points, see *Proofs and Illustrations,* chap. iii. pp. 76, 84, 86, 89.

II. 534-558; and compare Bishop Pearson's *Minor Theological Works,* II. 296-572.

love of Peace both at home and abroad, to withdraw or amend those elements of discord, which now separate us from each other? And, moreover, may we not appeal to their CHARITY, charity to us who cannot be persuaded to think of our system as they think of theirs, not because we attach an undue weight to our own judgment, but because we are unwilling to disregard the judgment both of Primitive Antiquity and of the Universal Church? And, once more, may we not appeal to their GRATITUDE? It is not argument, it is *sentiment*—the noble sentiment of gratitude (mixed, indeed, with antipathies for which towards Episcopacy at the present day, there is, I trust, no occasion),—it is, I repeat, the *noble sentiment of gratitude* that furnishes the basis on which the Presbyterian Establishment of this country now rests. "Reformed from Popery by Presbyters," it was claimed in 1689, that the Polity of the Church should again be made Presbyterian. Is not the time at length come, when the power of the same sentiment may no less justly extend itself yet farther? May it not be remembered how large a share in the triumphant issue of the struggle over which we are now invited to rejoice, was due not only to the sympathy, but to the moral and material assistance, which, in the very crisis of their cause, our Reformers in this country received from England?[1] The meeting of our Parliament, and their important Acts of 1560, would (humanly speaking) never have been accomplished without the advantages, which the English, under the government of

[1] See Tytler's *History*, VI. 159, 162, 177, 183 *seq.*, 198, 201.

Queen Elizabeth, had enabled them to gain in 1559. May it not be remembered how, from the effect of those advantages, the whole fabric of the unreformed Religion, which in 1559 had appeared so strong and so secure, collapsed suddenly into a ruinous heap? How the Bishops and Clergy, who, in their last great Council of that same year, could not be prevailed on to yield anything to the Reformers, but only offered them the alternative of *Death* or *the Decrees of Trent*, before the close of another year had no longer any thing within their power either to grant, or to refuse? Ought we not then, at a time when we profess to celebrate, with joy and thankfulness to God, the commemoration of those great events, ought we not to seek to make common cause with England, in support and propagation of the Truth which we both alike profess? Ought we not to endeavour to strengthen her hands, whereby, without sacrifice of principle, an accession of strength may likewise be received to our own?

In a doctrinal point of view, there is little or nothing in the Scotch *Confession of Faith* of 1560, the work of Knox and his companions, to which any one who has signed the *Articles of the Church of England* could reasonably object;[1] while on the other hand, one who accepts the Scotch Confession of Faith, might accept, I imagine, without difficulty, as Knox himself had done,[2] the Articles of the Church of

[1] See Bishop Russell's Appendix to Keith's *Catalogue of Bishops*, p. 42. "The old Confession of Faith, drawn up by the first Reformers, had all along been the received standard of doctrine to both" (Presbyterians and Episcopalians.) Tytler, VI. 212.

[2] That is, the Articles (42) of 1552, which Knox must have

England. And I have already reminded you that the General Assembly, under Knox's guidance in 1566, recognised the English Bishops and Clergy as "professing with them the truth of Jesus Christ." Certain it is, that the Scotch Confession, like the English Articles, is not disfigured by the more distinctive and obnoxious features of Calvinism; and that it sets forth no less clearly and faithfully the true doctrine of the Sacraments,[1] free from the perversions of Romanism on the one hand, and of Zuinglianism on the other.

But I have a further plea for the Communion which the Church of this country ought to hold with the Church of England; as there is another anniversary which it well becomes us to celebrate at the present time. I mean the anniversary of that great work, the translation of the Bible which we all use, and which was published two centuries and a half ago; a work executed not by Presbyters, acting without Bishops, but by Bishops and Presbyters, at the command of a King who first inherited in his own person the union of the English and the Scottish crowns.[2] Would to God that upon that ENGLISH BIBLE

signed, if not in England, yet at Frankfort. See Hardwick's *Reformation*, p. 156, and *Original Letters*, P. Soc. II. 756-762, Knox's *Works*, IV. 56.

[1] See on the one hand Cranmer's Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, commended by Knox, *Works*, III. 279; and, on the other hand, the sacramental doctrine of the *Confession of Faith*, commended by Collier, *History of Church*, II. 467; and Hardwick, *History of Reformation*, p. 155, *seq.* A full analysis of the *Confession* is given by Dr. Lee, *Lecture* V.

[2] It is right, however, to mention that this is also the actual Tercentenary of the Genevan Bible, in which Knox had taken part (with Coverdale, Whittingham, and Silby) before he left Geneva, and the first edition of which was published in 1560.

might be sworn the consummation of the Union then commenced,[1] and that nations whom nature made to become one, whom worldly Policy or intercourse have allied and associated as one, might also mutually embrace and confederate as one in the sight of God, and in the communion of the Body of Jesus Christ!

And what is there to forbid this union? Knox, besides a self-willed and intractable disposition, had his own personal causes for difference with England;[2] we have none. Our Reformers, as a body, had national feelings of hereditary animosity and suspicion towards England; we all, I trust, entertain feelings towards our sister country the reverse of these. What is there then to justify the separation which exists between the two ecclesiastical establishments; a separation which substitutes weakness in the place of strength, and too often mutual distrust and opposition in the place of mutual confidence and cooperation, and edification, and support, and love; a separation which the political union of the two countries has rendered at once less justifiable, and to the Church of England, more especially, through influence of various kinds, more injurious? An occasion like this invites us to look back over the interval which has elapsed during the last 300 years. In making that retrospect, we shall find but little, I fear, upon which, in regard to the triumphs or reverses of Ecclesiastical conflict, either party can reflect with much content. And still less, collectively,

[1] See Knox, II. 46. [2] See *Proofs and Illustrations*, p. 114-123.

as a Christian people, can we honestly congratulate ourselves upon our religious condition at the present day. The dissociation, as regards Christian fellowship, of the Upper from the Middle and Lower Classes, so that, for the most part, they meet not together at the worship of the God who made, and at the Table of the Saviour who redeemed us all; the consequent weakening or withdrawal of the influence which the one ought to exercise over the other for the common good; the absence of religious harmony in domestic intercourse; the fallen, shattered posture of our Parochial system, and the constantly recurring feud to which the question of Education of the poor, without even the excuse of doctrinal disagreement, continues to give rise; the dangers which all men see to threaten the Establishment, reduced as it now is to a minority, not only of property and influence, but of numbers also; and, meanwhile, the unhappy testimony which is afforded by statistical returns of various kinds, to the immoral condition of a large proportion of our community not only among the crowded populations of towns and cities, but in rural districts; these things, alas! are more than sufficient to stop our mouths, if we would venture to boast of ourselves as a people who have been rightly and thoroughly reformed. And if any one is of opinion that divided and discordant action (contrary as it is to the Word of God) is not, in part, the cause of these evils, or is competent to provide for them an effectual remedy—with such an one, the appeal, which I would make, can have no weight. But to

all who are not so minded, to all who would desire to act in obedience to the Word, and in dependence upon the blessing of Almighty God: to all such I would venture to say, let not this memorable occasion be allowed to pass unimproved; let it awaken in us a desire to fulfil the twofold law of loving the Truth and loving Peace; so that we may look forward to the future with a better hope when our hands are strengthened by united action, as of fellow-countrymen and fellow-Christians in a common cause, and when our hearts are warmed with brotherly love one towards another. Consider how many conscientious Presbyterians at the present time attend without scruple the Services of the Church of England; and then, who can justify the continuance of a state of things by which the common Enemy is a gainer, and we all together incur loss? Whereas who cannot see how much our happiness might be increased in our domestic, in our social, and even in our political and national relations; who cannot imagine what a glorious front of opposition we might present against sin and irreligion, not only at home, but throughout the world,[1] if the resources and the energies which we now possess, and too often misspend apart, were once legitimately and cordially combined?

For my own part, holding, as I do, the principle and the expediency of a Church Establishment no less firmly than Dr. Chalmers did, I cannot look upon the prospect of its overthrow without dismay. And

[1] See *Proofs and Illustrations*, chap. vii. p. 144, *seq.*

surely the time is come when She herself must feel that it may be said to her, in the words of the Prophet, without offence, "Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thine habitations; spare not; lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes." [1] Let the matter be weighed as in the sight of God, with a due sense of responsibility on the part of all; and with a desire, on the part of all, not to seek our own things, but only the things that are Jesus Christ's. Let no one ask, what, if conceded, would afterwards be found injurious to his own edification, and to the Truth itself.[2] The question is not, who shall give way most, or which party shall come over to the other, but *how all may come over to the cause of the Truth, and Peace, and National Unity.* It will be for the leading members of the Presbyterian communities, and especially of the Establishment, if they shall see fit, to inaugurate such a movement. That in any such attempt they would receive the hearty co-operation of the great Body of the Episcopalian Laity, and of ourselves, the Clergy, I can have no doubt. That with full time, and ample opportunities for explanation, they would carry with them the religious and intelligent of the population at large, I see no sufficient reason to disbelieve. That the Sovereign of these kingdoms would regard such a change with satisfaction and encouragement, it is at least not unreasonable to anticipate, when we consider the embarrassing position in which the Consti-

[1] Isa. liv. 2. [2] See Rom. xv. 2.

tution, as it now exists, places the successor to the Throne in relation to the two disunited Establishments;—a position which many of ourselves would be loath to occupy, and which, therefore, to impose upon another is scarcely consistent with fairness and liberality—still less with the loyalty and the love which subjects so blessed as we are, should rejoice to pay.

In the meantime, I for one will not withhold my voice from the testimony which this country has agreed to give to the chief of our Reformers, as "a great and heroic man;"[1] a man upon whose heart was stamped in imperishable characters the love of God, and of His truth; "a man," to repeat the words of Archbishop Spottiswoode, "endued with rare gifts, and a chief instrument that God used for the work of those times."[2] But it was too much to look for in any single champion, however good and great, that he should have been *all* that was required at such a crisis; and what he lacked, there was no other at all equal to him to supply. Grant to him the zeal and honesty of Latimer, and more than even Latimer's energy and intrepidity; still we have to seek for the holy calmness and deep learning of a Ridley,[3] for the modest self-distrust, and the judicious caution of a Cranmer; while, unhappily, there

[1] Principal Tulloch's *Leaders of Reformation*, p. 402.

[2] Spottiswoode's *History*, II. 184.

[3] Knox himself speaks of him, in his *Faithful Admonition*, A.D. 1554, as "that most learned and discreet man, Doctor Ridley, *true Bishop of London;*" and, in the same place, bears testimony to the "lenity, sincere doctrine, pure life, godly conversation, and discreet counsel of these three," viz., Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley.— *Works*, III. 299. Next to Knox, the two most eminent of our Reformers were John Willock and John Erskine of Dun.

was also wanting the official station and legitimate authority of them all. Hence the movement, while it faithfully represented at once the vigour, the vehemence, and the sternness of its hero's character, was defective in those qualities of a broad and comprehensive Catholicity, of which now, more perhaps than at any former period, we feel the need. A Presbyterian writer, distinguished alike by his position and ability, who has recently drawn the character of our Reformation with exemplary faithfulness, and with no common skill, admits that developed, or, to use his own expression, "hardened," as it soon became, into "a Calvinistic Creed and Presbyterian ritual," it was not destined "to penetrate the old Historical Families of the kingdom;" consequently, it has failed "to mould the nation, people, barons, and nobles into a religious unity."[1] The removal first of the Court, and then of our Parliament to England, has caused this failure to be at once less keenly felt (especially by the Barons and Nobles), and more difficult to remedy; but still it is felt—as every faithful Minister of the Gospel is bound to testify; felt most injuriously; felt in ways which should make a heart, a Christian heart, a patriotic heart, a heart such as Knox's was, ache to the very core.

[1] Principal Tulloch, *Leaders of Reformation*, p. 406. A similar and, unhappily, no less just remark occurs at p. 334. "The Scottish Reformation, . . . as has been long too sadly apparent, [had] no sympathetic expansiveness for moulding into religious unity classes widely separated in material rank, and in *intellectual and artistic culture*." On the other hand, Dean Trench, in his Sermon on the *Tercentenary Celebration*, etc., speaks of the English Church as having "continued to shape and mould for good the whole character of this English People."—*Sermons preached in Westminster Abbey*, p. 14.

And, though I will not deny it may be difficult to remedy, it is not, I trust, irremediable. Otherwise let us abandon this Commemoration as a cause of joy, and let us celebrate it only with lamentation and despair. The establishment of a national religious system which has not power to adapt itself to all classes of the community, is not a matter for a Christian people to rejoice over, but to reconsider, and, if it may be, by God's help, to amend. Let it be reconsidered then, at least, in this respect. Let it be made more comprehensive, more national, more catholic, more scriptural. Let the bands which now unite us to England, be tightened by the strongest of all ties—religious unity. Love of the Truth requires us to do this. Love of Peace requires us to do it. Let us not expect to remedy our disorders by efforts which leave everything out of sight but antagonism to the Church of Rome, thus sacrificing peace to love, but partial and defective love, of the Truth; or by an alliance which would merge all difference among Protestants, however heterodox, thus sacrificing the truth to love, yet a visionary and unreal love, of peace. Neither let us be content to throw over the naked deformity of our unhallowed separations the flimsy and deceptive veil of ministerial communion, thus confessing, without seeking to amend, what we see to be amiss in our present state. Let us not have recourse to the devices of men, but only to the Word of God. In so doing we shall best give the honour due to the memory of our Reformers, by following their ex-

ample, and we shall only cease to follow that example where they themselves at once fell away from their own professions, and forsook the Guide whom God hath given to assist both them and us in the interpretation of His own Word.

And therefore, in the name of our Reformers themselves; in the name of all that we owe to England, and she owes to us; in the name of benefits already given and received between us for the cause of Christ, from the dayspring of Iona to the present hour; and in the hope of other benefits still greater, which are yet to come, from full and free intercommunion (benefits for the promotion of education and learning, as well as of piety and true religion); in the name and remembrance of common dangers and of common deaths, when both Nations were called to pass through the fire of persecution for the Truth's sake; in the forgiveness and oblivion of mutual dissensions and of mutual wrongs;—in the name and in behalf of all these, I would respectfully submit what has now been said to the consideration of the Scottish people; of their Ministers and Elders; of their Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods, and General Assemblies: I would solemnly entreat them, in the name of the Truth and Peace which we are taught to love, to give to a matter so important the attention which it deserves: and I humbly and devoutly pray that God in His mercy may move and guide us all, through the illumination of His Spirit, to seek His glory and the common salvation in the way most pleasing and acceptable to Himself, for Jesus Christ's sake! Amen.

"A day [in July 1560] was statute [appointed], when the whole NOBILITY, and the greatest part of the CONGREGATION, assembled in St. Giles' Church in Edinburgh; where, after the Sermon made for that purpose, PUBLIC THANKS were given unto GOD for His merciful deliverance, in form as follows:—

"Seeing that nothing is more odious in Thy presence, O Lord, than is Ingratitude; . . . and seeing that Thou hast made OUR CONFEDERATES OF ENGLAND the Instruments by whom we are now set at this liberty, to whom we in Thy Name have promised mutual faith again; let us never fall to that unkindness, O Lord, that either we declare ourselves unthankful to them, or profaners of Thy Holy Name. . . . . *Retain Thou us so firmly together by the power of Thy Holy Spirit, that Satan have never power to set us again at variance nor discord.* Give us Thy grace to live in that Christian Charity which Thy Son, our Lord Jesus, has so earnestly commanded to all the Members of His Body; that other Nations, provoked by our example, may set aside all ungodly war, contention, and strife, and study to live in tranquillity and peace, as it becomes the sheep of Thy pasture, and the people that daily look for our final deliverance, by the coming again of our Lord Jesus; to Whom, with Thee and the Holy Spirit, be all honour, glory, and praise, now and ever. Amen."—*Knox's History*, II. 84-87.

PROOFS AND ILLUSTRATIONS

DESIGNED TO FORM

A MANUAL OF REFORMATION FACTS AND PRINCIPLES.

CHAPTER I.

APPEAL OF REFORMERS TO SCRIPTURE—RESISTANCE TO THIS APPEAL ON THE PART OF THEIR OPPONENTS.

It may seem almost superfluous to produce evidence in proof of the former of the two propositions which come under our notice in this chapter. But the stress which has been laid upon it in the foregoing Discourse (pp. 5-8) requires, perhaps, that I should exhibit here a few instances, out of many that might be quoted, to show the supreme regard and deference which our Reformers paid to the Word of God.

George Wishart, at his last examination in 1546. —"Verily that which I have heard and read in the Word of God, I taught openly and in no corners; and now ye shall witness the same, if your Lordships will hear me: *except it stand by the Word of God, I dare not be so bold to affirm anything.* These sayings he rehearsed diverse times."—Knox's *History,* I. 163. See also *Ibid.* 156, 165.

When brought to the stake, March 28, after prayer to God, he turned to the people, and said these words: "I beseech you, Christian Brethren and

Sisters, that ye be not offended at the Word of God, for the affliction and torments that ye see already prepared for me. But I exhort you that ye *love the Word of God, your Salvation,* and suffer patiently, and with a comfortable heart for the Word's sake, which is your undoubted salvation, and everlasting comfort. Moreover, I pray you, show my Brethren and Sisters, which have heard me oft before, that they cease not nor leave off to *learn the Word of God,* etc. etc." And last of all he said to the people on this manner: "I beseech you, Brethren and Sisters, to exhort your Prelates *to the learning of the Word of God,* that they at the least may be ashamed to do evil, and learn to do good."—*Ibid.* 169, 170.

Henry Balnaves.—"Christ teacheth us to search the Scriptures, for they bear witness of Him. And St. Paul saith, 'All things which are written, they are written to our learning, that through patience and consolation of the Scriptures, we may have hope,' that is, of eternal life. The which is *the mark at which shoot all the faithful;* for in the Scriptures of God all things are contained necessary for our salvation."[1]—*Treatise on Justification by Faith,* 1548. Reprinted in Knox's *Works.* See iv. 533.

John Knox.—"Wheresoever *God's Word hath supreme authority;* where Christ Jesus is affirmed, preached, and received to be the only Saviour of the World; where his Sacraments are truly ministered; and finally, where *His Word ruleth,* and not the vain fantasy of man, there is the true Church of Christ

[1] Compare English *Article* vi., Scots *Confession,* c. xviii.

Jesus."—*Letter to his Brethren in Scotland,* 1557. *Works,* IV. 267.

To pass on to the second point to be noticed here, viz., the opposition which these appeals to Scripture met with on the part of the non-reforming Clergy.

Knox, in his *History* (I. 95) speaks of "certain tyrannical *Acts,* made at the devotion of the Prelates, for maintaining of their kingdom of darkness, to wit, that *under pain of heresy, no man should read any part of the Scriptures in the English tongue,* neither get any tractate or exposition of any place of Scripture." But this would appear to be overstated; for in the original draught of the Act of Parliament of 1542 (referred to in the foregoing Discourse, p. 8), for authorizing the use of the Old and New Testaments, we read, "The Lords of Articles being advised with the said writing, find the same reasonable . . . because *there was no law shown, nor produced to the contrary.*"[1] At the same time, a document preserved in the State Paper Office, dated March 16, 1542-3, of which an extract was first published by Tytler,[2] sufficiently shows how determined the Ecclesiastical Authorities were to *prevent,* if possible, *the reading of the New Testament,* and to enlist the arm of the civil power in that profane attempt. We cannot therefore doubt that the complaint made by Balnaves, in 1548, in regard to the Bishops and other Clergy, is substantially true. "Alas! think ye not shame (which

[1] See *Act. Parl. Scot.* II. 415; *Keith,* I. 89.

[2] *History of Scotland,* V. 323; compare Buchanan, I. 291.

are bound and obliged, under the pain of eternal damnation, to teach your flocks this manner of doctrine) to *inhibit and forbid them to look upon the Scriptures,* either to hear or read them."—*Treatise on Justification,* chap. xxvi. The same statement is repeated by Knox in his *Brief Summary* of that Treatise, 1548. The tyrants in these days *forbidding men to read the Scriptures.*[1] As an instance of the Bishops *discouraging* even their Clergy from the study of the Bible, the story told of Crichton, Bishop of Dunkeld, is well known.[2]

Moreover, there is proof that one of the charges brought against Sir John Borthwick, who was accused of heresy, in 1540, but escaped to England, consisted in his "having *the New Testament printed in English,* Œcolampadius, Melanchthon, and diverse treatises of Erasmus, and other condemned Heretics."[3] Knox, however, in his *History,* I. 99, admits that the Clergy "denied not but the Scripture may be read in the Vulgar Tongue, *provided that the Translation were true.*"

At the same time we know that *Acts of Parliament* were passed, in 1525 and 1535, "against those who hold, dispute, or rehearse *the damnable opinions of the great heretic Luther,* his disciples and followers," etc., with the additional enactment, in the latter year, forbidding any stranger to import "any books of the said Luther's disciples, etc., *under pain of imprison-*

[1] *Works,* III. 26.

[2] See Tytler's *History,* V. 270, *seq.*

[3] See Foxe's *Acts and Monuments,* II. 613; Lee's *Lectures,* I. 31, 330, and the additional evidence given *Ibid.* p. 37 and p. 81, note.

ment, and of escheating of their ships and goods," and that "none of the king's lieges have, use, keep, or conceal any books of the said heretics, or containing their doctrine and opinions."[1] And an *Act* still more severe, in March 1540-41, to the effect "that no manner of persons argue nor impugn the Pope's authority *under the pain of death, and confiscation of all their goods,* movable and unmovable.[2]

The following passage exemplifies both the propositions which have been now illustrated—the desire of the Reformers, and the refusal of their opponents, to submit all questions between them to the arbitration of the Word of God. It relates to the year 1558:—

"The Prelates were highly incensed, and . . . . carrying themselves more imperiously than before, answered that 'they would not depart one jot from the *Decrees of Trent.*' Afterwards, being a little calmed, they made offer to commit the cause to dispute, which by those of *the Congregation* (this was the title given commonly to the Reformers) was accepted upon two conditions; one that *the Controversies in Religion might be decided by the Scripture;* the other . . . *Both the conditions were denied,* for neither would they admit any other Judge but the Canon Law and Councils, nor," etc. etc.[3]

[1] See *Keith*, I. 27. Compare Canon 48 of the Council of 1549. Wilkins' *Concilia*, IV. 58.

[2] Keith, *ib.* p. 29. Tytler, V. 284.

[3] Spottiswoode's *History*, I. 267. Compare Knox's *History*, I. 306; II. 142, 339, 515, 518.

CHAPTER II.

THE LAST PROVINCIAL COUNCIL, 1559.

THE three events to which, in an ecclesiastical point of view, we owe (humanly speaking) the somewhat precipitate[1] Reformation crisis of 1560, were, *first*, the condemnation of Knox, in his absence, after his opponents had shrunk from meeting him on the day which they had appointed for bringing him to trial, in 1556; *secondly*, the execution of Walter Miln, in April 1558; and, *thirdly*, the proceedings of the Provincial Council summoned by Archbishop Hamilton at Edinburgh, in March, and continued to April 1559. These, together with the barbarities practised some fifteen years before by Cardinal Beaton at Perth, the remembrance of which could never be effaced, were all of them acts such as signally to fulfil the saying,

"Quos Deus vult perdere, dementat prius."

And of these three striking instances of infatuation, the last is that which affords, perhaps, the broadest and firmest standing-ground for those who would defend whatever there was of hardship and irregu-

[1] Calvin in his letter to Knox, November 8, 1559, calls it "incredibilem successum tam brevi temporis spatio."—*Epist. et Resp.* p. 442. Hardwick "a gigantic march of revolution and reform."—*History of Reformation*, p. 152. See also Tytler, VI. 214.

larity in the conduct of the Reformers in 1560. Or, at all events, it may be said, that no one is competent to form a strictly fair and accurate estimate of the relative position and merits of the two parties in that crisis who has not given his attention to the Canons of the Council to which I refer. And yet it is remarkable how small and comparatively unimportant a space the proceedings of this Council have been made to occupy in the view of the Reformation which has been hitherto presented by, I believe I may say, *all* our Church historians.[1] It may be doubted, indeed, whether any of our earlier writers, Knox, Buchanan, Lesley, Row, Spottiswoode, Petrie, or Calderwood, had ever seen the Canons which the Council passed. Certain it is that they have done nothing to preserve them either in whole or in part. Bishop Keith, to whom we are indebted for so much other valuable information of the same kind, was, I believe, the first who discovered that an autograph copy of them was still preserved in the Library of the Scotch College at Paris. Writing in 1735, after his historical work was completed, but before it issued from the press, he mentioned the existence of the MS., and expressed a hope that it would be published either by Dr. Wilkins, who was then engaged upon his great collection of British Councils, or in a supplement to the more general work of Father Labbé.[2] Accordingly it appeared

[1] Tytler's *History of Scotland* does not even mention the meeting of the Council.

[2] See Keith's *History*. Advertisement to the Reader, I. p. cviii. and compare p. 184. Also Keith's *Scottish Bishops*, p. 260.

in the last volume of Wilkins' *Concilia*, published in 1737, pp. 267-70. Lord Hailes, in composing his *Historical Memorials* concerning the Provincial Synods of the Scottish Church (1772), though he had Wilkins' publication before him, scarcely gives us so much insight into the acts of the Council as might have been expected. He remarks, indeed, that "had Keith ever seen the Canons of this Council, he would have acknowledged that they (the members of the Council) did not avoid entering upon the controverted points; and, if he had reason to praise their *wisdom and moderation* in 1551, he must have found another name for their conduct in 1559."[1] This is certainly true. But besides the acts of this Council, and the two mandates for summoning it (*rival* mandates we may almost call them, one from the Archbishop of St. Andrews, and another from the Archbishop of Glasgow), Wilkins also published, from the same Library at Paris, a most important document, of which (as Dr. M'Crie has pointed out[2]) it is still more surprising that so keen and accurate an investigator as Lord Hailes should have taken no notice. It is in the shape of "a Remonstrance," consisting of thirteen articles, which was "presented to the Prelates, and other Churchmen assembled" in the Council, "craving redress of several grievances complained of in the Ecclesiastical Administration of Scotland." This Remonstrance proceeded, as Wilkins suggests, "either from the Lords of Session, whereof one half and the President were ecclesiastics,

[1] Hailes' *Annals*, III. 369, note. [2] *Life of Knox*, I. 124, note.

or from some other men of distinction, zealous for preserving the (then) Established Church." As no one of our writers (so far as I am aware) has called attention to this important document,[1] except Dr. M'Crie, and his notice of it does not exceed ten or twelve lines, and as Dr. Wilkins' *Concilia*, always a very costly book, is now become so rare as scarcely to be obtained at any price, I think it desirable for the interests of the truth, to lay the said document, or at least all the main and more interesting parts of it, before my reader :—

"I. In the first, remembering that our Sovereign Lord of good memory that last deceased (James v.), in his late acts of Parliament for the common weal of this realm, thought necessary to make a public Exhortation[2] unto my Lords the Prelates and rest of the Spiritual Estate, for reforming of their lives, and for avoiding of the open slander (disrepute) that is given to the whole estates through *the said Spiritual Men's ungodly and dissolute lives ;* And siclike (also), remembering in divers of the late provincial Councils holden within this realm, that point

[1] The parties from whom it came, and the document itself, are probably the same as those alluded to by Spottiswoode in the following terms :—"Some of them that *affected quietness* proposed other conditions of reconcilement, namely, that if the Congregation would suffer the Mass to be held in the wonted reverence, if they would acknowledge Purgatory, confess the Invocation of Saints, and admit prayers for the Dead, they should be allowed to pray and administrate the Sacraments in a known language. But those conditions were held so ridiculous and absurd as they were not vouchsafed any answer." — Spottiswoode's *History*, i. 267.

[2] On March 14, 1540-41. See Keith's *History*, i. 29.

has been treated of, and sundry statutes synodal made thereupon,[1] *of the which, nevertheless, there has followed none or little fruit as yet, but rather the said Estate is deteriorated, nor emends by any such persuasion as has been hitherto used;* And since the said Estate is mirror and lantern to the rest, it is most expedient, that they presently condescend to seek reformation of their lives, and for executing duly of their offices, every one of them effeiring (attending) to their own vocation and care committed unto them to do, and namely, that *open and manifest sins, and notorious offences* be forborne and abstained from in time to come, etc. etc.

"II. Item, That they provide for preachings and declarings of God's Word, sincerely and truly to be made in every Parish Kirk of this realm upon all Sundays and other holidays, at the least on Yule, Pasche, Whitsunday, and every third or fourth Sunday, etc. etc.

"III. That all Preachers of the Word of God, before they be admitted to preach the same publickly to the people, be first examined duly, etc. etc.

"IV. Item, That there be no Curates or Vicars of Parish Kirks made in times to come, but such as are sufficiently qualified to minister the Sacraments of holy Kirk in such form and order as after follows, and that they can distinctly and plainly read the

[1] See especially in the Acts of the Provincial Council held in 1549, Wilkins' *Concilia*, iv. 46, *seq.* It may be mentioned, as an instance of the abuses of those times, that Lord James Stewart (natural son of King James v., and afterwards Earl of Murray), having been made Prior of St. Andrews when five years old, sat as such in that Council at the age of sixteen!

Catechism and other directions that shall be directed unto them by their Ordinaries, unto the people, etc. etc.

" V. Forsomuch as there is nothing that can move men more to worship God, nor (than) to know the effect, cause, and strength of the Sacraments of holy Kirk, nor nothing that can move men to dishonour the said sacraments more than the ignorance and misknowledge thereof; therefore seeing that all Christian men and women, before they be admitted to the using and receiving of the said Sacraments, should know the vigour and strength of the same, for what causes the same were instituted by God Almighty, how profitable and necessary they are for every Christian Man and Woman, that duly and reverently are *participants thereof;* therefore, that there be a godly and fruitful Declaration set forth in English tongue to be first shown to the people at all times; when the Sacrament of the blessed Body and Blood of Jesus Christ is exhibited and distributed, and sick like (also) when Baptism and Marriage are solemnized in face of holy Kirk? and that it be declared to them that assist at the sacraments, what is the effect thereof, and that it be spirit at (inquired of) them by the Priest ministring, if they be ready *to receive the same,* etc.

" VI. That the Common Prayers with Litanies *in our vulgar tongue* be said in every parish Kirk upon Sundays and other holy days after the Divine Service of the Mass, and that the evening prayers be said efternein (afterwards) in likewise.

"VII. [This Article[1] is against the compulsory exaction of sundry payments and offerings to the Clergy; which 'gives occasion to the poor to murmur greatly against the State Ecclesiastic,' etc.]

"VIII. Item, Because the lieges of this realm are heavily hurt by the long process of the Consistorial Judgment, as has been at more length declared and shown unto my Lords of the Spirituality; and that poor men having just cause ofttimes are constrained to fall from their righteous action through lengthening of the said process and exorbitant expenses that they are drawn into, as well in the first instant, as by appellation from place to place, from judge to judge, and *last of all to the Court of Rome;* albeit the matter were *never so small,* and albeit men obtain sentences never so many by the ordinary Judges of this realm, yet all in vain, and no execution shall follow thereupon, while *the Appellation be discussed in Rome,* etc., therefore it is necessary that provision be made for shortening of the Process Consistorial, for relieving of parties from exorbitant expenses, and that it be considered *what matters shall pass to Rome by Appellation,* of what avail, worth, and quantity they should be of, and that the Appellation unto Rome should not suspend the execution of sentences given here within this realm.

"IX. X. [These two Articles contain complaints of sundry Papal claims that 'hurt the privileges of the Crown and the Common-weal of this realm,' etc.]

"XI. Item, That no manner of person within this

[1] See M'Crie's *Life of Knox,* Notes G. and X.

realm pretend to usurp such hardiment as to dishonour or speak irreverently of the Sacrament of the blessed Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, but that the same be holden in such reverence, honour, and worship, as becomes Christian men to do, and is commanded by the law of God and holy Kirk, and that none dishonour the Divine service of the Mass, nor speak injuriously nor irreverently thereof.

"XII. Item, That no man pretend to use the Sacraments and Ceremonies of Marriage, Baptism, and blessed Body and Blood forsaid, nor suffer the same to be ministered, but in such manner, as is aforesaid; and by *such persons as that are admitted duly*, and *ordained* to the administration thereof.

"XIII. Item, That no manner of persons be so bold as to burn, spoil, or destroy Kirks, Chapels, or religious places and ornaments thereof, nor attempt anything by way of deed to the hurt and injuring thereof, or for deforming or innovating the louable (laudable) ceremonies and rites thereof used in holy Kirk, but that they be used as aforetime, and while (until) further order be taken by the Prince and Ministers of holy Kirk, having power, and the same duly insinuated (committed) to them."

In addition to this friendly Remonstrance, there were delivered to the Council from the Queen-Regent, through the hands of the Earl of Huntly, Chancellor of the kingdom, certain preliminary "Articles of Reformation," which "the Congregation" had presented

to her Grace. These Articles, four in number, are to be seen in Lesley's *De Rebus Scotorum*, p. 504, and after him in Keith, I. 185, and Lord Hailes, III. 267. The first Article is: "That public Prayers be conceived and the Sacraments administered in the vulgar tongue." The rest relate to matters of discipline. The Second Article shows that there was no wish on the part of the Reformers at that time (less than two years before they gained the ascendency) to do away with Diocesan Episcopacy.[1] It is as follows: "That in time coming *Bishops be admitted with the assent of the Barons of the Diocese*, and Parish Priests with the assent of the Parishioners."

And, with these two documents before them, and with the knowledge of the progress which the Reformed Doctrines had made during the *thirty years* previous in this country, while Queen Elizabeth was now upon the throne in England, and *ten years* had passed since the publication of the first Reformed Prayer-Book of King Edward VI., what was the course pursued by the Council, which the Queen-Regent had convened, "of *all the Ecclesiastics in the kingdom that were known to be men of learning and capacity*, that they might fall upon some method to heal the present sores that had infected the Body of the Church?"[2] In the first place, in the Preamble to its Acts, the Council commits itself to the *Tradition and Custom of the Catholic Church*, "rejectis vanis novitatibus et suspectis opinionibus." Next, in

[1] See above, p. 28.

[2] Keith's *History*, I. 184.

a preliminary Act, it "ratifies, approves, and confirms" (unless otherwise specified) all "the Decrees, Constitutions, and Statutes" of the previous Councils held in 1549, 1551, and 1552. Of the two former of these Councils the Canons (in number 57 and 17 respectively) have been preserved in the Royal Library at Paris, and are published by Wilkins, IV. 46-60, and 69-73. Of the third,[1] the only remaining record is given by Bishop Lesley (p. 476), who informs us that, besides decrees for repressing Heresy, establishing the authority of the Catholic Faith, and *thoroughly purging the manners of the Clergy*, it was declared in full Assembly, that *all things which had been determined in the Council of Trent, under the auspices of Paul* III., were to be held "justa, rata, ac TANQUAM DEI IMPERIO FIXA!" The Council of 1549 had also shown its servile adherence to the Decrees of Trent, in its 39th Canon, in which, on the question of Pluralities, it is content to refer itself "ordinatis *seu ordinandis* in Concilio Tridentino *nondum dissoluto*."

It is well known that the Council of Trent sat (with more or less of interruption) from the beginning of 1546 to the beginning of 1552, and then, after a suspension of ten years, sat again from Jan. 7, 1562, to the end of the following year. It is with the former of these periods (comprehending the six-

[1] Bishop Lesley, and so, after him, Lord Hailes speaks of this Council as held at *Linlithgow;* but the first Act of the Council of 1559 mentions it expressly as held in *Edinburgh*. It might have been adjourned from Linlithgow to Edinburgh, as the Council of 1549 was.

teen first Sessions) that we are now concerned. We have seen that our Scottish Council of 1552 adopted all the Tridentine Decrees of that period "as fixed by the Command of God;" and that our last Council, of 1559, solemnly confirmed that adoption. It concerns us then to know what were the matters of Faith and Practice which were thus to be bound upon the consciences of the Reformers. They were to be obliged to receive and hold under pain of anathema:—

1. That the Traditions of the Church are to be equally esteemed and venerated as the Holy Scriptures. (Session 4.)

2. That the greater portion of the Apocryphal Books (including the Book of Baruch, never before canonized) are to be regarded in the same class, as Sacred and Canonical, with the other Books of Holy Scripture. (The same.)

3. That they who fall into sin after Baptism cannot be again justified without the Sacrament of Penance. (Session 6.)

4. That after grace has been given to repent, the guilt of sin is not remitted without undergoing temporal punishment, either in this world, or, after this life, in *Purgatory.* (The same.)

5. That the Sacraments are neither more nor less than *seven,* and that they were all instituted by Christ. (Session 7.)

So far the Council had proceeded, when Pope Paul III. died, November 1549, and was succeeded by Julius III., who, as Cardinal del Monte, had been President of the Council.

6. That in the Sacrament of the Eucharist there is contained, truly, really, and substantially, the Body and Blood of Christ, together with His Sonship, Divinity, and therefore Whole Christ. (Session 13.)

7. That there is such a marvellous conversion, most fitly called *Transubstantiation,* of the Elements into Christ's Body and Blood, that the natural *Substances* of Bread and Wine do not remain. (The same.)

8. That whole Christ is contained in either Element, and that not only during *use,* but before and after. (The same.)

9. That Christ is to be adored as *contained in the Sacrament,* and that it is not Idolatry so to adore Him. (The same.)

10. That Confession to a Priest is necessary *jure divino,* and that all Christians are obliged to confess once a year. (Session 14.)

We may now return to our own Council of 1559. Besides the preliminary Act, already mentioned, the Council passed thirty-four Canons, almost all of a disciplinary character, such as had been enacted at the previous Councils, and of which, as the friendly Remonstrance testifies, "there had followed none or little fruit." Thus the first four Canons relate to Clerical Concubinage (which is again forbidden), and to the unhappy offspring of such alliances; but nothing is said as to any relaxation of the law, from which such evils arose; and, for anything that appears to the contrary, marriage, which Scripture pronounces to be "honourable in all men," was still to be forbidden to the Clergy.

The fifth Canon forbids the Clergy to entertain, or hold familiar intercourse with any persons whatever who were *suspected of heresy,* or who *refused to be present at the Sacrifice of the Mass,* etc. etc.

The thirteenth Canon provides that the assistance of the Secular arm be called in against any of the Laity who neglected to perform the penances imposed upon them for offences committed against the Ecclesiastical Laws.

Other Canons were drawn up evidently with a view to propitiate the Friends who had presented the "Remonstrance," as may be seen by comparing their Article 2 with Canons 14 and 15;[1] Articles 3 and 4 with Canons 16 and 19; Article 5 with Canon 17; Article 7 with Canons 21 and 31; Article 8 with Canon 24; and Article 12 with Canons 33 and 34. But nothing is provided in compliance with the application, made in Article 6, for "Common Prayers and Litanies to be said in our vulgar tongue," still less with the larger demand of "the Congregation" to the same effect;—nothing in answer to the complaint, made in Articles 8, 9, and 10, against the grievance of Appeals to Rome, and of the sundry exactions of the Papal Court. Upon the former point, indeed, we are informed by Bishop Lesley that the Council returned answer, "that they could on no account dispense with the using of any other

1 The Article asked for "preachings upon all Sundays," or "at the least every third or fourth Sunday." The Canons are not satisfied with preaching four times a year, which had been prescribed in the former Council, but only order it to be "frequentiùs."

language than the Latin in the public Prayers, etc., as having been so long in use, and as being appointed by the Church under the most severe penalties."[1]

It remains to speak of the 16th Canon—the only one which enters expressly upon points of doctrine. It is headed *De uniformi doctrinâ per singulos Prædicatores observandâ*, that is, it was to provide for the *universal observance of uniformity of doctrine, especially in regard to the Articles following:—*

1. That not only the express teachings of Scripture, but the Traditions, Rules, and Ordinances of the Church are binding upon Christians both in public and private.

2. That it is right to venerate the Saints, and to call upon them to pray for us, inasmuch as Christ bestows many blessings through their prayers and intercession.

3. That it is lawful to use images of Christ, and of the Saints, "ad eorundem repræsentationem et imitationem."

4. That we must firmly believe in a Purgatory for Souls after this life, wherein they pay the penalty yet due for their sins; from which, however, they may be released more speedily through the good works of the Living.

5. That in the Eucharist there is really the true Body of our Lord, His true Flesh and true Blood—"immò totus Christus;"—wherefore it is not Bread and Wine, but our Crucified Lord Jesus Christ whom

[1] *De Rebus Scotorum*, p. 504. Keith's *History*, I. 185.

we rightly worship, whether during Mass, or wheresoever the Eucharist is reserved or carried about.

6. That, inasmuch as we are to believe that "Whole Christ" is received under one Element only, Communion in both kinds is not necessary for the Laity, but is sufficient in the Bread only, "juxta legitimam Ecclesiæ sanctionem."[1]

7. That the Sacrifice of the Mass, instituted for the remembrance of Christ's Passion, is profitable, through the virtue of the same Passion, both for the Living and Dead.

8. That no one but a lawfully ordained Priest has power to consecrate the Eucharist.

I have dwelt at so much length upon the Acts of this Council, for the reasons which I stated at the commencement of this chapter. I have now only to add one remark, which serves to illustrate, somewhat curiously, how little accurate attention the history of the Council has hitherto received (as before remarked), either from our earlier or more recent writers. The fullest original report is to be found, I believe, in Knox's *History;* it is in these words :[2]—

"The Bishops continued in their Provincial Council even unto that day that John Knox arrived in Scotland (from Geneva). And that they might give some show to the people that they minded Reformation, they spread abroad a rumour thereof, and set

[1] Compare Archbishop Hamilton's *Catechism*, as quoted by Lord Hailes, III. 264, *seq.* note.

[2] The same account is copied *verbatim*, by Calderwood, I. 438.

forth somewhat in print, which of the people was called 'the Twa penny Fayth.'[1]

"1. Amongst these Acts, there was much ado for caps, shaven crowns, tippets, long gowns, and such other trifles.

"2. Item, That none should enjoy office or benefice ecclesiastical except a Priest.

"3. Item, That no kirkman should nurse his own bairns in his own company; but that every one should hold the children of others.

"4. That none should put his own son [into any Ecclesiastical office] in his own benefice.

"5. That if any were found in open adultery, for the first fault he should lose the third of his benefice, for the second crime, half, and for the third, the whole benefice."[2]

Upon this passage Lord Hailes remarks as follows:

"The account of those canons, as given in Knox's History, is exceedingly partial and erroneous." And in a note he adds:—

"This is a strong charge, but *I will make it good;* whether the passage here censured be the work of an interpolator, or of Knox himself, is nothing to me. I seek truth where I can find it; if I am successful in

[1] Lord Hailes' severe remarks upon Bishop Keith for (*inter alia*) confounding "the Twapenny Faith" with the Catechism, which was authorized by the Council of 1551 (eight years before), and which goes by the name of Archbishop Hamilton's, are, on the whole, just. He sums up the long note to which I refer (p. 265), in these words:—"From all this it may be concluded that the thing called in derision "the Twapenny Faith," must have been totally distinct from Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism." But what it was, he does not attempt to explain. A few words upon the point will be found at the end of this chapter.

[2] Knox's *History*, I. 110. Compare Lee's *Lectures*, I. 73.

my search, I am happy; if not, *unfortunate.* I am willing to admit that Knox was zealous in a good cause, but no zeal can justify a man for misrepresenting an adversary. My freedom may offend, but if we are to be governed by names and authorities of man, why did we leave the Church of Rome, where there are as good names and authorities of man?

"The words in Knox's History are: 'Among their Acts there was much ado for caps, shaven crowns, tippets, long gowns, and such other trifles.'

"*This I admit,* and it shows that the author *knew the contents of the canons,* and did not take them from the worst of all information, popular report.

"I cannot blame the historian for considering those matters as *trifles,* for at first I viewed them in the same light. But it will appear upon examination, that the canons concerning the garb of ecclesiastics were necessary and proper."[1]

It will scarcely be believed, after all this,

(1.) That, whereas Knox is professing to describe the Acts of the Council of 1559, Lord Hailes has fallen into the mistake of supposing him to speak of the Council of 1549, and accordingly has been so "unfortunate" as to found the whole of this "free" criticism upon a mere blunder.

(2.) That, so far from Knox or his interpolator having "shown that he knew the contents of the canons," the truth is, he is even more unfair and in-

[1] Hailes' *Annals,* III. 260. Lord Hailes goes on to show that there is also nothing in the canons to justify the statements contained in the *second* clause of Knox's third count, or in *any portion* of the fifth count. Compare canons 2, 3.

correct than Lord Hailes has stated or could have supposed: for in these canons (of 1559) there is *not only no word about the punishment of kirkmen for adultery*, or about their "holding the children of others;" but so far from there being "much ado for caps, shaven crowns, etc.," there is merely one short canon, the seventh, *De Habitibus*, which orders the regulations of the former Council "de tonsurâ et habitibus," to be carried into effect, and exhorts "all Archbishops and Bishops to appear in their Episcopal dress at all proper times;" whereas of the canons of 1549, of which Lord Hailes is speaking, there are two which deal with clerical dress; the 4th, rather a long one, "De vestibus Clericorum," and the 7th, "De gravitate habituum Clericorum."

Had not Lord Hailes fallen into this mistake, he would probably have been led to discover what the writer in Knox's *History* meant by "the Twapenny Fayth." I have no doubt that he refers to a Tract put forth by this Council in compliance with the suggestion made in the 5th Article of the *Friendly Remonstrance*, to the effect "that there be a godly and fruitful Declaration set forth in the English Tongue, to be first shown to the People at all times, when the Sacrament, etc. etc." (see above, p. 59). I am led to this conclusion by the following words of Canon 17, *De Exhortationibus ante Ministerium Sacramentorum*:—

"Insuper ut populus Christianus Sacramentorum Ecclesiæ verum effectum, vim, ac usum facilius ac Commodius intelligere valeat, statuit hoc presens

Concilium *quasdam Catholicas Exhortationes, easque succinctas declarationes Sacramentorum,* etc. etc., *auctoritate hujus Concilii edendas,* et inferius inserendas, quas singuli Parochi . . . ipsa Sacramenta ministraturi . . . publicè et distinctè recitent, etc. etc. Et idem observent Episcopi in ministratione Sacramenti Confirmationis, etc. etc., *quæ quidem exhortationes in calce hujus Consilii inscribuntur.*"

Dr. Wilkins adds in a note—"Declarationes et exhortationes hæ in MS. Baluziano"—from which he published the Canons of the Council—"omissæ sunt."

It is not probable that any copy of them is now in existence. But they agreed, no doubt, in point of doctrine with the corresponding portions of Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism.[1]

[1] For information respecting this Catechism, see Knox's *Works,* I. 124, 291, Editor's Notes; Keith, I. 149; Hailes, III. 263; M'Crie, p. 245, Note Y; Lee's *Lectures,* I. 75.

CHAPTER III.

OUR REFORMERS' APPEAL TO PRIMITIVE ANTIQUITY.

LET it first be clearly stated what the appeal to antiquity implied. Rightly understood, it implied no derogation whatever from Holy Scripture, as the *supreme and sole original authority in matters of faith and of religious controversy;* but merely a concession, that in the interpretation of Scripture upon controverted points—where the reason and private judgment of one man, or one set of men, are opposed to the reason and private judgment of another, equally qualified, perhaps, in all appearance, to pronounce upon the question—an umpire is required, in order to avoid endless disputes and un-Christian divisions and separations, which are expressly forbidden in the New Testament; and that *the best umpire we can have is the clear, certain, and unanimous voice of Primitive Antiquity.*

I have said in the foregoing Discourse (p. 21) that our Reformers, when they first constructed their own system, in 1560, and from that time forward, did, from whatever cause, overlook or disregard the umpire to which, in 1558, they had themselves appealed.

Let it be admitted at once what is stated in the Confession of Faith, chap. xviii., entitled "*Of the Notes* by which the true Kirk is discerned from the false, and *who shall be Judge of the Doctrine;*" where we read, "When controversy happens, for the right understanding of any place or sentence of Scripture, or for the Reformation of any abuse within the Kirk of God, we ought *not so much* to look what men before us have said or done, as unto that which the Holy Ghost uniformly speaks within the Body of the Scripture, and to that which Christ Jesus Himself *did and commanded be done.* For this is one thing universally granted that the Spirit of God, *which is the Spirit of Unity,* is in nothing contrarious unto Himself."[1] It is, I say, admitted that we ought not to look to what men before us have said or done, *so much* as we ought to look to that which the Holy Ghost uniformly speaks. And as against certain portions of the Romish doctrine, for instance, the worship of the Virgin Mary, the Denial of the Cup to the Laity, the doctrine of Purgatory, etc. etc., inasmuch as we decline to acknowledge, with Romanists, the authority of Tradition as co-ordinate with the Word of God, we think it sufficient not to look at all beyond the

[1] Knox uses the same language in his first interview with Queen Mary, in the year after the *Confession of Faith* was drawn up; only on that occasion he argues that we are to look *not at all* "to what men before us have said and done," because "the Word of God is plain in itself; and if there appear any obscurity in one place, the Holy Ghost, which is never contrarious to Himself, explains the same more clearly in other places; *so that there can remain no doubt,* but unto such as *obstinately remain ignorant.*" —*History,* II. 254. No wonder the Queen was not satisfied with such a statement.

pages of Holy Scripture for the determination of these questions.

But we know how this principle fails us—how it may mislead us—upon other points of controversy, where the command of Christ, or the *voice*, or, if it be so, the *silence* of the Spirit in Holy Scripture is less clear and express. Not that God has left us without sufficient and most conclusive means—means which we regard as amply satisfactory in all matters of civil and secular investigation—in order that we may ascertain His apparent will, in regard to the points to which I refer, by the knowledge which, through patient inquiry, He enables us to gain of the teaching and practice of the Primitive Church.[1] Here then is the controversial field, which would seem, no doubt, comparatively of minor consideration in the eyes of our Reformers of 1560, but which is to us in the present day of the greatest practical importance; the field in which opposite parties, equally desirous to do honour to the Word of God, and to exclude all other authority as original or co-ordinate, have been led to form different conclusions, and consequently to fall asunder into un-Christian separation. And here it is, I say, that we require those other helps which God has given us, to assist us in the interpretation of His word, and the discovery of His will—

[1] If it be thought that matters which God has left to be *fully* ascertained in this manner, without the *express precept* of His written Word, must therefore be of less and inconsiderable importance, let it be remembered that among such matters are included *the canon of Holy Scripture itself, the observance of the Lord's day, the Baptism of Infants, and even the Doctrine of the Trinity*—matters not merely of form or discipline, but *most necessary Faith.*

helps which our Reformers, as we have seen, professed that they were prepared to recognise, but of which, unhappily, they neglected to make use.

1. Let me exemplify this first, in the case of CONFIRMATION.

Our unreformed Council of 1559 had adopted the Decrees of the Council of Trent, and by so doing, had again pronounced Confirmation to be one of the seven Sacraments, and to have been ordained by Christ Himself.

It is sufficient to appeal to Scripture against such a determination.

But is Scripture silent, *as our Reformers were,* about the use and necessity of Confirmation altogether?

The Holy Spirit in the Epistle to the Hebrews, vi. 1, 2, speaks plainly of "the laying on of hands" as one of "the principles of the doctrine of Christ," and as part of the very "foundation" of all Christian teaching. It is, therefore, something *very important.* We examine the passage carefully. We observe the order in which the *six* so-called "principles" are arranged:—1. "Repentance." 2. "Faith" (both which we know were always required as preparatory to baptism). 3. "Baptism." 4. "Laying on of hands." To which are added the two grand motives of all our actions as Christians. 5. "Resurrection of the Dead." 6. "Eternal Judgment." The only question here is about the fourth of these principles. We cannot think that it refers to something *temporary and extraordinary,* as were the supernatural gifts, or

to something *partial* and *applicable only to a particular body* or *exceptional case among Christians*, as Ordination of Clergy, or Absolution of Penitents, because the *five other principles* here mentioned, being plainly such as refer to all Christians of all times, it is reasonable to conclude that *the remaining one* is equally extensive and universal in its application. In short, we suppose it to be the same as that which we now more commonly call Confirmation.

And our faith is strengthened in this interpretation by what we read in Acts viii., concerning the conversion of the Samaritans, the first missionary enterprise undertaken by the Church. It seems to us that the Apostles Peter and John are there exhibited as putting in practice this first "principle of the doctrine of Christ," by *confirming* those whom Philip the Deacon had before *baptized*.

Taking these two passages together, as mutually illustrating and corroborating each other (not to mention one or two more to the same effect), we *think* that the interpretation which we put upon them is perfectly legitimate, and we are *quite sure* that there is nothing in Scripture which is sufficient to *disprove* that interpretation. Still, if a controversy is to be raised upon the point, we are not sorry to have recourse to other judgments besides our own, and especially to those who lived "nighest to the Primitive Church."

Let us see then what several of the chief and "most learned of the ancient Fathers" have to say upon this question.

ST. CYPRIAN understood the passage of the Acts to refer to Confirmation. "They who believed in Samaria were baptized by Philip the Deacon, and therefore had no occasion to be rebaptized; but only that which was wanting to them was supplied by Peter and John; so that by their prayer and imposition of hands, the Holy Spirit was invoked and poured forth upon them. *The same is now practised also among us.* They who are baptized, are brought to the chief Pastors of the Church, that by *our* prayer" —Cyprian being a Bishop—"and imposition of hands, they may receive the Holy Ghost, and be completed with the seal of the Lord."—*Epist.* lxxiii. c. 9.

So, too, the anonymous author of the treatise, *De Re-baptismate,* who opposed Cyrian on the question of re-baptizing Heretics:—"By the laying on of the hand of the Bishop the Holy Spirit is given to every one who believes."—*Migne's Patrologia,* III. 1187.

ST. JEROME also interprets the passage of the Acts in the same manner as St. Cyprian. "Are you ignorant that this is the custom of the Churches, that hands are laid on those who are baptized, and the Holy Spirit invoked over them? *Do you ask where this is written? It is in the Acts of the Apostles.*" And he adds these remarkable words: "Even if it were not founded upon the authority of Scripture, THE CONSENT OF THE WHOLE WORLD UPON THE POINT would have the force of a (Divine) precept." And that Confirmation was administered only by the Bishop, appears from what follows shortly after in the same place. "I am aware that this is the cus-

tom of the Churches, that in the case of those who have been baptized by Priests and Deacons, at a distance from the greater cities, the Bishop goes forth in order to lay his hands upon them, and pray that they may receive the Holy Ghost."—*Advers. Lucifer,* chap. 8, *seq.* II. 164.

ST. AUGUSTIN.—"No one of Christ's Disciples gave the Holy Ghost. They prayed, however, that He might come upon those on whom they laid their hands. . . . Which practice the Church still observes through her chief Pastors."—*De Trin.* lib. xv. chap. 46, VIII. 1509. And he thus anticipates the objection that in the Apostles' time too *supernatural gifts* were conveyed by the laying on of hands, whereas now in Confirmation nothing of the kind occurs, or is to be expected. "At the first, the Holy Ghost fell on those that believed, and they spake in languages which they had not learnt, as the Spirit gave them utterance, which miracles were suitable for that time. . . . But when now hands are laid on persons in order that they may receive the Holy Ghost, is it expected that they should speak with tongues? or, when it is seen that they do not so speak, is any of you so perverse as to say, *those persons have not received the Holy Ghost?*"—*In Epist. Joann.* Tract. vi. chap. 10, III. 2542, *seq.* And, again, in another work to the same effect: "In our times the gift of the Holy Ghost is not attested by occasional and sensible miracles as it was formerly, *to recommend the new Faith, and to enlarge the newly-planted Church.* For who now expects that they on whom hands are

laid, in order that they may receive the Holy Ghost, should suddenly begin to speak with tongues?"—*De Bapt. adv. Donat.* lib. iii. chap. 21, IX. 209.

It is upon testimony such as this that the Church of England, in her 60th Canon, declares, "It hath been *a solemn, ancient, and laudable custom in the Church of God, continued from the Apostles' time*, that all Bishops should lay their hands upon children baptized and instructed in the Catechism of the Christian Religion, praying over them and blessing them, which we commonly call Confirmation."

It may be remarked that the administration of this holy ordinance appears from the beginning to have been reserved to Bishops, not so much to add dignity to the chief Pastors of the Flock, as to afford an opportunity for bringing them into connexion with every member of it, and, more particularly, through the fatherly Benediction bestowed on each, to *symbolize*, as indeed the outward sign in Confirmation very beautifully does, the brotherly unity which ought to exist among all Christians. Upon this point the author requests to be allowed to insert here a passage from a Sermon which he was appointed to preach before the University of Oxford in 1857.

"It is this holy rite (viz., Confirmation) by which, over and above the strengthening and protecting grace bestowed upon the individual who receives it worthily, the *uniting* and *concentrating* power of the Holy Ghost *in respect to the body of the Church at large*, is especially symbolized and conveyed. Many a hand administers Baptism, many a hand admini-

sters the consecrated tokens of Christ's Body and Blood; one only hand throughout each district of the fold of Christ administers Confirmation. *Why is this?* It is, my brethren, in order that every head, so soon as it becomes of age to will and to do, may be brought under that one hand, and so be taught to will and to do nothing of itself alone, but all in dutiful unison and conformity with Christ's law of child-like humility and God-like love. It implies the gathering not only of each individual lamb, but of all the flock *under the hand of the one good Shepherd* (according to the Church's prayer, 'Let *Thy Fatherly Hand*, we beseech Thee, ever be over them'), and herein the descent of the same Holy Spirit, with his sevenfold gifts, Who descended upon Jesus after Baptism. Hence it is that the Scripture speaks of it as among 'the principles of the doctrine of Christ,' and places it, together with *Repentance*, and *Faith*, and *Holy Baptism*, and *belief in the Resurrection of the dead*, and *eternal judgment*, at the very 'foundation' of our Christian life and Christian hope. Hence it was that when the people of Samaria had received the Word, and had been baptized, while as yet the gospel had not been communicated to the Gentiles—so deep in the first *missionary practice*, as in the *first teaching* of the Church, does this ordinance lie—the Apostles who were at Jerusalem sent to them, out of their own body, Peter and John—a master fisherman and a mender of the nets—in order that they might *complete*, by the gift of the Holy Ghost, through the laying on of hands, what Philip had

begun by the preaching of Faith, and Repentance, and the administration of Holy Baptism. And such being the place accorded to it in Scripture and in Apostolic use, it is unnecessary that I should remind you, how the same Ordinance received a full and continuous testimony in the subsequent practice of the primitive Church, so that, in the words of St. Jerome, 'Etiam si Scripturæ auctoritas non subesset, TOTIUS ORBIS IN HANC PARTEM CONSENSUS instar præcepti obtineret.'"[1]

I have observed that the *Confession of Faith* of 1560 is *silent* upon the subject of Confirmation. The same, unhappily, cannot be said of the *Acts of the General Assembly* for 1638, among which we read the following words:[2] "Concerning Confirmation, the Assembly findeth it to be comprehended in the clause of the Confession, where the five bastard Sacraments are condemned.[3] And *seeing Episcopacy is condemned, Imposition of hands by Bishops falleth to the ground!*"

Thus, we are tempted to remark, one false step leads to another;[4] if it be, as we believe, that Confirmation is one of the six "foundation-principles

[1] "Mending of the Nets, being the Oxford Ramsden Sermon for 1857, upon Church Extension in the Colonies and Dependencies of the British Empire," pp. 9-11.

[2] P. 20.

[3] I have looked in vain for any such clause. The Confession (c. 21), speaks very properly of the "Two chief Sacraments," but makes no mention, that I can find, of any others, real or pretended. The *Westminster Confession*, 1647, also makes no mention of Confirmation.

[4] The Lutherans have been more bold, for they have retained Confirmation, but then they have also retained, at least in many places, the *form* of Episcopacy. Compare upon this subject the complaint of the learned Lutheran, Delitzsch, in his commentary upon Hebrews vi. 2, quoted in Dr. Wordsworth's New Testament.

of the Doctrine of Christ." But, seeing that the discontinuance of Confirmation is made to rest upon the abolition of EPISCOPACY, let us now go on to apply to this latter question the same process of argument, viz., *the teaching of Scripture interpreted or illustrated upon a controverted point by the aid of Primitive Antiquity.*

2. It is known that we are content to waive all dispute respecting the Scriptural use of the *names* 'Bishop' and 'Bishopric.' We are willing to grant, if desired, that these names might be applied, at first, very loosely and promiscuously.[1] All that we contend for is the *office* itself, involving a disparity in the ministry, and the subordination of Priests and Deacons. Let the reader consider how laxly and indefinitely similar designations, such as *overseer* and *superintendent*, would be likely to be used at first with reference to oversight or superintendence over a smaller or a larger number in an infant society, especially in a society whose original organization, being in many places confessedly and necessarily imperfect, was supplemented for a time by *extraordinary officers*, such as inspired Prophets and Evangelists. In this respect (as was observed in the foregoing Discourse), we may compare what took place among our own Reformers. The Reformation doctrines had been held and preached in Scotland more or less for thirty years and upwards, and yet,

[1] The same is equally true of the Scriptural use of the *name* Deacon.

in 1560, the Reformers were unable to find more than *five* of their number who were competent and willing to fill the office of "Superintendent," though they wished and designed to appoint *ten*, according to the ten stations or dioceses into which they had portioned out the whole country.[1] In like manner the up-growth and full development of the regularly organized threefold ministry in the first age of the Church, was necessarily and *designedly* (see 1 Tim. iii. 6, "not a novice") slow and gradual. At Jerusalem, indeed, as being then the headquarters and (for a time) almost the only sphere of Evangelical operations, the regular ministry appears to have been organized almost immediately after our Lord's Ascension and the Descent of the Holy Ghost, that is, from the very first. And here it is that *we must begin to raise the question of the right interpretation of Holy Scripture.* At Jerusalem during this early period, A.D. 33-43, we find the existence of Deacons (Acts vi.) and of Elders or Presbyters (Acts xi. 30). We also find St. James, the "Brother" of our Lord, mentioned in a way, and with marks of distinction, for which the previous notices of his name, as it occurs in the gospels, had not prepared us. See Acts xii. 17, and Gal. i. 18. Again, about A.D. 48, we see the same pre-eminence given to St. James at Jerusalem, Gal. ii. 9, and still more in Acts xv. 13-19, where he appears as *President of the Council*, though St. Peter and St. Paul, as well as other Apostles, were also present. See also Gal. ii. 12.

[1] See above, p. 34; Principal Lee's *Lectures*, I. 171, 185.

Again in A.D. 56, we find St. James, as before, resident at Jerusalem, with all his Presbyters around him, prepared to receive St. Paul on his return thither, after his third and last Apostolic Journey (Acts xxi. 18). Once more, antecedently to all these events, we are told by St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 7), that our Lord, after His Resurrection, vouchsafed to show Himself, specially and alone, to this same St. James.

Here then are seven distinct passages of Holy Scripture; and we desire to know how we are to account for the remarkable position which this particular Apostle is seen to occupy in these several passages, a position which is nowhere expressly explained, or noticed in the New Testament; in other words, we desire to know how to interpret, in a rational and satisfactory manner, these several passages of God's Word.

The answer to the inquiry is found, in a manner which admits of no dispute, by reference to a succession of competent witnesses, among the ancient Fathers, viz.—Papias (a Disciple of St. John), Hegesippus, Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Jerome, Augustin, and Chrysostom,—who all testify[1] that this St. James was not only one of the twelve Apostles, but a Bishop, a Diocesan Bishop—being appointed, some

[1] I forbear to quote the passages here referred to, or even to give the references. But I am able to vouch for the perfect accuracy of what is stated above, having carefully examined all the authorities, amounting to no less than *thirty-three distinct pieces of historical evidence*, in the originals.—See Knox, III. 44.

of them say, by our Lord Himself, others, by the Apostolic Body, to be the first Bishop of Jerusalem. With the help of this recorded fact, the passages of Scripture which required explanation, are easily accounted for, and satisfactorily interpreted. But can they be accounted for, can they be interpreted upon any other supposition ?

And if it be objected that we have no mention of St. James' appointment as *Bishop* in the New Testament, let it be remembered that we have likewise no mention of the appointment of *Presbyters* at Jerusalem, of whom, nevertheless, we read in Acts xi. 30; xv. 6; xxi. 18, and elsewhere.

So much then, for the interpretation of these passages of Scripture, and for the form of Government instituted in the first fully organized Christian Church, viz., that of Jerusalem and the surrounding district.

We may apply the same process, and we shall obtain the same result, with reference to whole portions of Scripture which bear upon the same question : I allude particularly to the Epistles which St. Paul addressed to Timothy as Bishop of Ephesus, and to Titus as Bishop of Crete, and to that part of the Apocalypse which contains the letters written by St. John to the Angels or Bishops of the Churches of Asia Minor. Let it be remembered that these Pastoral Epistles of *St. Paul* and *St. John* carry us on not only into the Government of Churches of the Gentiles, but to *two distinct periods of the Apostolic age,* the latter of which is more than thirty years in

advance of the former. We place the martyrdom of St. Paul in A.D. 65, and the death of St. John in A.D. 100. Of the long interval between these two events we have no *inspired* record. *Yet it was during this interval for the most part that the foundations of the Church were laid throughout the world.* And upon what principles were they laid? We can only answer this question by looking to the known Historical result, a result acknowledged and recorded by writers who were subject to no Ecclesiastical bias. When an author like Mr. Fynes Clinton, the greatest chronologist who has appeared since the days of Scaliger, records the succession of Bishops in the four principal Apostolic Sees, with as much precision and certainty as he records the succession of Archons at Athens and of Consuls at Rome, we may feel sure that the facts rest upon a basis which no incredulity can suffice to shake. And what is the result? That the succession commenced, not only at Jerusalem, but at Antioch, at Rome, and at Alexandria,—*i.e.*, in the capitals of the three then known quarters of the globe—before the death of St. John.[1] And it is equally certain that what was begun so early in these and other principal cities of the Roman Empire, was in the course of another period of thirty or fifty years established universally elsewhere; and so continued universal throughout the Church, equally in the East and West, North and South, without interruption till the period of the Reformation, that is, during fifteen centuries. And

[1] See *Fasti Romani*, II. 535-558.

still the vast majority of Christians, reformed and unreformed, retain the same organization.

It was in reliance upon a course of reasoning such as that which I have now exemplified, that the Reformers of the Church of England solemnly declared, in 1552, eight years before the Scotch *Book of Discipline* was drawn up, as follows :—

" It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and Ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."—*Preface to Ordination Services.*

And the judicious Hooker wrote, fifty years later—

" It clearly appeareth out of Holy Scripture that Churches Apostolic did know but three Degrees in the power of Ecclesiastical Order, *at the first,* Apostles, Presbyters, and Deacons ; and *afterwards,* instead of Apostles, Bishops."—*Eccles. Pol.* Book v. c. lxxviii. 9.

And again : " I may securely therefore conclude that there are at this day in the Church of England no other than the same degrees of Ecclesiastical order, namely, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, which had their beginning from Christ and His Blessed Apostles themselves." —*Ibid.* sect. 12. See further testimonies below, chap. iv. p. 101.

If then, our Reformers had abided by the appeal which they made to Primitive Antiquity as an umpire in the Interpretation of Scripture ; if they had consulted, as they proposed, " the determination of the first four General Councils, in which the learned

and godly Fathers did examine all matters by God's Word," or " the writings of the Ancient Fathers," or " the godly approved laws of Justinian the Emperor"[1]—which brings the appeal down to A.D. 535—it is certain they would have found enough to convince them that both Confirmation and Episcopacy were Scriptural and Apostolic Ordinances (if, indeed, they ever doubted of this fact), and little or nothing to support them either in substituting for the latter a new system of Church Polity, or in allowing the former to " fall to the ground."

3. Let us proceed to apply the same line of argument with reference to the PUBLIC WORSHIP of Almighty God.

The principal passages which relate to Congregational Worship in the New Testament are the following :—

Luke xi. 2.—" *When ye pray, say,* Our Father," etc. etc., that is, say a certain *prepared form* of prayer. As the learned Bishop Pearson has observed " Our Lord gives His Disciples not a *Directory,* but a form ; He tells them not *how,* but *what* they are to say."[2]

Matt. xviii. 19, 20.—" I say unto you, That if two of you shall *agree* on earth as touching anything that they shall ask," etc. etc. Here the Greek word translated " agree," properly means shall " agree *vocally.*"

[1] It is sufficient to refer to Novell. 137, " De creatione Episcoporum," and to Constitutt. 120 and 134. The former adopts the Decrees of the first four General Councils.

[2] *Minor Theol. Works,* II. 103.

1 Cor. xiv. 16.—"Else, when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen"—in the original it is, say *the* Amen, *i.e.*, the well-known customary *Amen*—"at the giving of thanks."

These passages would lead us to suppose that Congregational worship among Christians was designed, and ordered from the beginning, to consist of *prescribed forms*, in which the Congregations might "with one mind and *one mouth* glorify God" (Rom. xv. 6); and because the voices of many speaking together for any length of time would be apt to mar the solemnity of the Service, and interfere too much with the office of God's appointed minister, the use of the responsive *Amen* was the authorized method by which the people were to signify their *vocal* as well as *mental* agreement in the several acts of Divine worship.

This is the interpretation which we put upon those passages of the New Testament, and we are quite sure that there is no word in the whole of Scripture to contradict that interpretation. Still, others, we know, have taken a different view; and we, therefore, appeal to the testimony of primitive antiquity to see how the same passages were understood and acted on in those early times.

The known existence from the earliest times of written and prescribed Liturgies is the shortest and best answer that can be given to this inquiry. Accordingly, it is asserted by one whose great theological learning will not be disputed, that "in all

the churches of Christ over the world, however distant from each other, we find set forms of public prayers. . . . Indeed, the exercise of the public worship of God in set and prescribed forms of prayer hath been *the practice of all settled churches of God,* not only ever since Christianity, but also before our Saviour's coming into the world. . . . The same order which St. Paul gives to Timothy (1 Tim. ii. 1, 2) was observed in the same manner in the Catholic Church throughout all succeeding ages, the exercise of the public worship being never in any age of the Church (before this latter age of innovation) permitted and intrusted to the discretion and abilities of every private minister."[1]

If this be so, well might another great Episcopal divine (whose admirable Exposition of the Creed is used, I believe, as a text-book by many Presbyterian students in theology), exclaim, with reference to the practice of public extemporaneous prayer, "Non admittimus Spiritum orationis adversus Spiritum unitatis."[2] I venture to add the following striking remarks translated from the same Latin Discourse :—"What is it that gives such great power to our Public Prayers ? What is it that renders them so pleasing to God and so efficacious ? Is it not the union of numbers of men conscious of the same wants, consenting to the same petitions, and importuning the Divine Goodness with the same entreaty ? And if this be so in regard to each separate congregation, must it

[1] Bishop Bull, I. 329, 334, 340.
[2] Bishop Pearson, *Minor Theological Works,* I. 409.

not hold good much more in the case of all? How can we suppose that our most merciful Father, Who has assured us that He is present in the midst of us where two or three are gathered together—how, I ask, can we suppose that it would be possible for Him to deny those favours which are asked by all His children throughout the whole Church, in every congregation, on the same day, at the same hour, with one mind, and in the *same words*?"[1]

And, let it be remembered, that this practice, too, is still retained by the vast majority of Christian communities, not only unreformed but reformed.

I know this matter is sometimes argued as if it were merely a question of expediency, or of taste, arising out of the temperament, or supposed edification of the individual worshippers. But, in answer to such a notion, let me quote the just and weighty words of Knox himself: "We may not think us so free nor wise that we may do unto God and unto His honour what *we think expedient*."[2] And again, in another place, "Mark, brethren, that many make an IDOL of their own wisdom or fancy, more trusting to that which *they think good* than unto God, who plainly saith, not the things which seem good in thy eyes do unto thy God, but what thy Lord God hath commanded thee."[3] Yes, truly, the question is not of our will and pleasure, but of God's will and of His glory. And we need to be assured that His

[1] Bishop Pearson, *Minor Theological Works*, I. 408.

[2] *Vindication of the Doctrine that the Mass is Idolatry*, *Works*, III. 37.

[3] *A Godly Letter to the Faithful in London*, *Works*, III. 196.

glory is better promoted, and His will more obeyed by unwritten and unprescribed addresses (involving among other consequences the violation of unity in public worship, and separation from the universal practice of the Church), before we should be warranted in adopting them in preference to Liturgical Forms.

Let it be remembered all along that the first petition of our Reformers, and the object which they repeatedly professed, was "that the reverent face of the Primitive and Apostolic Church should be reduced again to the eyes and knowledge of men."[1] And this the author of Knox's History, at the commencement of his fourth Book, boasts that they had done. "In that point," he writes, "our God hath strengthened us, till that the work was finished, as the world may see." What, however, they really did, as well as the causes which prevented them from doing what they had originally proposed, will be found more accurately described in the following eloquent passage, written in 1669 :—

"Ex Ecclesiis Reformatis vidimus nonnullas *laudabili potuis conatu ad id, quod optimum putabant, collinedsse,* quam eventu exoptato, quod fieri debuit, effecisse. Enimvero homines, *pristino corruptelarum statu exacerbati,* et incredibili omnia renovandi ardore accensi, et *sævissimâ simul adversariorum immanitate lacessiti,* modum servare difficillimè potuerunt. Quarè dum idololatriam extirparent, vix reverentiam

[1] Knox's *History,* I. 306; II. 264.

Divini Nominis cultui necessariam retinuerunt; traditiones humanas dum ejicerent, vereor ne et Apostolicas expulerint; dum cæremoniarum nimium apparatum excuterent, metuo ne Ecclesiam penitus denudarint; et dum auctoritatem hominum in fidei negotio rejicerent, SS. Patrum inconcussa dogmata, et Conciliorum firmissima decreta"—the very things to which our own Reformers had appealed—"suis placitis postposuerint."[1]

[1] Bishop Pearson, *Orat.* vi. *Minor Theol. Works*, i. 434.

CHAPTER IV.

OUR REFORMERS' APPEAL TO SCRIPTURE WHEREIN MISDIRECTED—ORIGIN OF PURITANISM.

It is stated in Balnaves' *Treatise on Justification,* of which Knox drew up his *Brief Summary* in 1548, that "nothing from the beginning of the world hath ever been so displeasant in the sight of God, as to invent any manner of worshipping Him which He hath not commanded." And the instance which he alleges in confirmation of this statement is somewhat curious, when we consider how many of the Reformers allowed themselves to enter upon the work of the ministry in irregular ways. "For this cause king Saul was ejected, and his posterity lost and fell from the kingdom. In the which example ye shall consider that the works wrought by king Saul were right excellent in the sight of man, and also done by him of a good intent and for a good cause. He offered sacrifice for fear that the people should [not] pass from him, he being then prepared for battle against the enemies of God. . . . . Was this not a good zeal and intention? But ye may read the great punishment God laid upon him, which shall remain for an example in all ages to come."[1]

[1] Knox's *Works,* III. 531, in the Summary, p. 26.

In the previous year, Knox in his disputation at St. Andrews, had entered upon the same matter, and first broached the fallacy which afterwards led to such miserable turmoil and confusion in the Church both in this country and in England. The Sub-Prior had asked, "Why may not the Kirk for good causes devise ceremonies to decore the sacraments, and other [parts of] God's service?" And the answer of Knox came, again and again, to this: "The said John answered oftener than once. That the spouse of Christ hath neither power nor authority *against* the Word of God."[1] But the question was not of power to order any thing *against* the Word of God, which his opponent probably would not have maintained, but rather of the method of carrying out the injunction of Scripture itself, that "all things" in the worship of God are to be done "decently and according to order,"[2]—order which, nevertheless, in the Scriptures themselves, is not, and therein is repeatedly acknowledged[3] not to be, *fully* specified.

The same fallacy is to be found, only carried to a still greater extreme, in the apology which Knox delivered at Newcastle, April 1550, when "the Bishop of Durham (Tonstall) and his Doctors were present," in *Vindication of his doctrine that the mass is Idolatry.* On that occasion, having laid down the general proposition that "that is principal *Idolatry* when our own inventions we defend to be righteous in the sight

1 Knox's *Works*, I. 195, 200.
2 1 Cor. xiv. 40.
3 See 1 Cor. xi. 2, 34, "The rest will I *thoroughly* set in order when I come." 2 Thess. ii. 15; III. 6.

of God, because we think them good, laudable, and pleasant," he goes on to apply it even to "rites and ceremonies," and so comes to the conclusion "that all worshipping, honoring, or service of God, invented by the brain of man, in the Religion of God, *without* his own express commandment, is Idolatry."[1]

Ten years afterwards, we find the same conclusion introduced in the *Book of Discipline*,—"By *Idolatry* we understand the Mass, Invocation of Saints, Adoration of Images, and finally, *all honouring of God not contained in his holy Word*."—Chap. iii. 3.

It did not occur to Knox and our Reformers, that by such an argument they were condemning as idolatrous the conduct of our blessed Lord and his Apostles. We know that our Lord himself acknowledged in the Church a power of decreeing rites, and of changing those rites and ceremonies, "according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word."[2] This, I say, we know, because in the eating of the Passover, He gave his sanction to several particulars which formed no part of the original Divine and Scriptural Institution—such as the recumbent posture, the drinking of wine, and the singing of an Hymn. The truth is, that both our reason and our sense of reverence are to be consulted in regard to all

[1] Knox's *Works*, III. 37 *seq.*, 47. Compare his *Brief Exhortation to England*, 1559: "Let God's Word alone be the rule and line to measure His Religion. What it commandeth, let that be obeyed; what it *commandeth not, let that be execrable*." And again, "Whatsoever God (in matters of Religion) hath not sanctified by His expressed word, the same, I say, remaineth *execrable, polluted*, and *defiled*." *Works*, v. 516. See also in the next page, note 3.

[2] Article 34 of the Church of England.

such matters;[1] and these will make all whose office it is to order the Church's Ritual, not only very considerate as to *what* they add, and *how* they add to the necessary accidents of Divine worship, but also very cautious not to place any such addition upon the same footing of obligation with the essentials which have been prescribed by God himself.[2]

It is lamentable to think that it was mainly owing to the non-perception or non-observance of this truth (a truth which is now, I believe, generally admitted by intelligent Presbyterians), and to the opposite views which Knox in particular had early imbibed, and too hastily advocated,[3] that a union was not effected in the year 1560 between the Reformed Churches of this country and of England. At least so we are informed by Bishop Lesley, who thus writes concerning the Articles then agreed upon between the French and English Commissioners, the latter being Sir William Cecil, and Dr. Nicholas Wotton :—

"Here is necessary to be remembered the cause why in this treaty there was nothing agreed touching Religion; because the Commissioners of England would have wished the Congregation of Scotland to have received the Discipline and Ceremonies conform to

[1] See Hooker, *Ecc. Pol.*, Book ii. *passim*.

[2] See Bishop Sanderson, *Sermon* v. *ad Clerum*. *Works*, II. 156-158.

[3] *E.g.* in his Sermon at Frankfort, March 1555. See M'Crie's *Life*, p. 73. In his *Exhortation to England*, 1558, *Works*, v. 515, *seq.* See in last page, note 1. In his *Letter to Mrs. Anne Locke*, April 1559, where we read "I can do nothing but hold and affirm all things *polluted*, yea *execrable and accursed*, which God by His Word hath not sanctified in his Religion." Calderwood, I. 433. See also Knox's *Works*, IV. 223, 231, 468.

the order established lately before in their Parliament of England ; *so that both the realms might have been uniform in Religion and Ceremonies;* but the Ministers and Congregation of Scotland, thinking their own profession, after the order and Discipline of Geneva, to be more pure, *as containing no other ceremonies than are expressly mentioned in the Scripture,* therefore would not receive or admit any other ; and *the Commissioners from France would not approve none of the two;* and therefore that matter was delayed."[1]

And yet, in order to justify their own proceedings in this country, our Reformers in their *Confession of Faith* published the same year, expressed themselves as follows :—

"The other (cause of General Councils) was for good policy and order to be constituted and observed in the Kirk, in which, as in the House of God, it becomes *all things to be done decently and in order.* Not that we think that *one Policy* and *one order in ceremonies* can be appointed for all ages, times, and places, for as *ceremonies such as men have devised*"—which, be it remembered, Knox had proved to be Idolatry!—"are but temporal, so may and ought they to be changed, when they rather foster superstition than that they *edify the Church*"—not, therefore, an impossible supposition—"using the same."—Chap. xx.

Sound and moderate sentiments, precisely similar to those expressed in the English Article (34), if we except only the words, "good policy," and "one

[1] Lesley's *History*, p. 292.

Policy," thrown in, as I have said, by our Reformers to meet the necessities of the position which they were then about to assume. I have already dealt with this subject in the preceding chapter, and will not resume it in detail. Only, as this has now become the favourite view in regard to the question of Church Policy—a view well suited to the laxity and latitudinarianism of the present age—to imagine that, as God hath instituted no particular form of government for states, so neither has He done so for His Church, I would wish to ask, can it ever be *proved* that a Policy, which was universal throughout the Church at the time of St. John's death, or within fifty years after it, was intended to admit of a revolutionary change? And, if this can *not* be proved, can it ever tend to edification to change that Policy, considering that thereby unity is liable to be broken, and many may be reasonably offended at what they will consider an unjustifiable deviation from a Divine or at least an Apostolic ordinance?

I am well aware that Hooker, in aiming to establish his grand argument in defence of the English Church, upon a basis of law which should be all-sufficient and co-extensive with the Puritan errors which he desired to refute, has been content to place the source of ecclesiastical power *originally* in the whole body of the Church, as of civil power in the whole body of the State, and that he has been much commended by modern authors of eminence (for instance, by Mr. Hallam) for the liberality of his sentiments in this respect. But even in this view,

which waives[1] the express authority of Holy Scripture, and therewith all claim of Divine right for any one particular form of Church Polity, his statements, as based (if it be so) only upon natural reason and historical records, are sufficient to secure all that is required. According to Mr. Hallam, "it was maintained by this great writer not only that ritual observances are variable, but that *no certain form of Polity* is set down in Scripture as generally indispensable for a Christian Church."[2] And yet even in Hooker, of whom this may be said with apparent truth (upon the ground, especially, of a passage which Mr. Hallam there quotes, and which occurs in Book iii. chap. x. 8 of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*), we find besides the testimonies before produced, p. 25, note 3, and p. 88, such expressions of opinion as these :—

"What need we to seek far for proofs, that the Apostles, who began this order of regiment of Bishops, did it not but *by Divine instinct*, when without such direction, things of far less weight and moment they attempted not? . . . Before Timothy was employed in those Episcopal affairs of the Church about which the Apostle St. Paul used him, the Holy Ghost gave special charge for his Ordination, and prophetical intelligence more than once what success the same would have. And shall we think that *James was made Bishop of Jerusalem, Euodias, Bishop of the Church of Antioch*,[3] the *Angels in the Churches of*

[1] But see *Eccl. Pol.*, Book iii. chap. iv. and chap. xi. 20.

[2] Hallam's *Constitutional History*, I. 294.

[3] See Fynes Clinton's *Fasti Romani*, II. 535, who gives 43 A.D. as the probable date of Euodias, first bishop of Antioch.

Asia, Bishops, that Bishops everywhere were appointed to take away factions, contentions, and schisms, without some divine instigation and direction of the Holy Ghost? Let us not fear to be herein bold and peremptory, that if anything in the Church's government, surely the first institution of Bishops was from Heaven, was even of God; the Holy Ghost was the author of it."—*Eccles. Pol.*, Book vii. chap. v. 60.

Again: "That so the ancient Fathers did think of Episcopal Regiment, that they held this order as a thing received from the Blessed Apostles themselves, and authorized even from Heaven, we may, perhaps, more easily prove than obtain that they all shall grant it who see it proved."—*Ibid.* 3.

And with regard to the whole of Hooker's argument in his third Book, and in particular, therefore, to the passage quoted by Mr. Hallam, it must be borne in mind that in the seventh Book (from which both the foregoing extracts are taken) Hooker himself avows that a change had taken place in his opinions upon this question, in the interval, as we may suppose, since the four first Books were published. His words are these:—

"Now although we should leave *the general received persuasion held from the first beginning,* that the Apostles themselves left Bishops invested with power above other pastors; although, I say, we should give over this opinion, and embrace *that other conjecture* which so many have thought good to follow, and which *myself did sometimes judge a great deal*

more probable than now I do, merely that after the Apostles were deceased, churches did agree amongst themselves, for preservation of peace and order, to make one Presbyter in each, chief over the rest, etc. etc. . . . this order, taken by the Church itself (for so let us *suppose* that the Apostles did neither by word nor deed appoint it), were, notwithstanding, more warrantable than that *it should give place and be abrogated,* because the ministry of the Gospel and the functions thereof ought to be from heaven."—*Eccl. Polity,* Book vii. chap. xi. 8.

This, I say, supplies all that is required when it is pleaded, as in the foregoing Discourse, that in seeking to obtain peace and unity, the Episcopacy of Scotland should not be required to "give place."

But further, in extenuation of this (lower, and, as the present author cannot but believe, less correct) view, as certainly entertained by many in Hooker's time, and, probably, by some of the Reformers previously, let me be allowed to quote the following remarks from the distinguished pen of the last editor of Hooker's works—remarks which, I am persuaded, are as just and true as they are charitable :—

"Should it be asked how such accomplished divines, as Jewel and others of his class undoubtedly were, could permit themselves, for any present benefit to the Church, so to waver in so capital a point, with the full evidence of antiquity before their eyes, it may be replied, first of all, that in some sort *they wanted that full evidence with which later generations have been favoured.* The works of the

Fathers had not yet been critically sifted, so that in regard of almost every one of them men were more or less embarrassed, during the whole of that age, with vague suspicions of interpolation. The effect of this is apparent in various degrees throughout the controversies of the time; but on no question would it be more felt than on this, of the Apostolical succession and the frame of the visible Church, because that was a subject on which, more continually perhaps than on any other, temptations to forgery had arisen; and also because *the remains of St. Ignatius*, in particular, for a single writer the most decisive of all who have borne witness to Apostolical principles, *were all that time under a cloud of doubt* which was providentially dispelled in the next age by the discovery of a copy unquestionably genuine. This consideration, as it accounts (among other things) for the little stress which Hooker seems to lay on quotations from St. Ignatius, to us most important and decisive, so it must in the nature of things have placed his predecessors, of whom we are now speaking, under a considerable disadvantage, as compared with the writers of the following century, and in all candour should be taken into account; on the one hand, by those who would take advantage of the silence of the Reformers to disparage the Apostolical succession; on the other hand, by the advocates of that doctrine to prevent their judging too hardly of the Reformers themselves for their comparative omission of it."[1]

[1] Keble's *Preface to Hooker*, I. 61. See also p. 77, where the same writer adds: "Hooker, in common with most of his con-

To return to the more immediate subject of this chapter.

The Puritan principle with regard to rites and ceremonies, will always betray its unsound and impracticable character, by the inconsistency and apparent caprice with which it is carried out. To be consistent, it ought neither to *add* nor *omit* otherwise than the Scripture expressly sanctions. It has, notoriously, done both. The Catholic system, which justifies, within certain limits, the use of our reason in all such matters, has also done both, but it has done so consistently. For example, it has prescribed *the use of a surplice*, and it has discontinued *the kiss of charity*. After all, the Puritan system has taken greater liberties with the letter of Scripture. It has discontinued not only the kiss of charity, which is expressly ordered in Scripture,[1] but also the use of *Confirmation*, of *frequent Communion*, and, to some extent, of *the Lord's Prayer*, all which may plead Scriptural sanction, more or less direct. With regard to the second of these, instead of the frequent "breaking of bread," of which we read in the *Acts of the Apostles*, the *Book of Discipline* has declared as follows :—"*Four times* in the year *we think sufficient* to the Administration of the Table," chap. xi. 5.

temporaries, shrunk from the legitimate result of his own premises, the rather, as the fulness of Apostolical authority on this point had *never come within his cognizance*, whereas the next generation of divines entered on the subject, as was before observed, *fresh from the discovery of the genuine remains of Ignatius*." Ignatius is reckoned by Fynes Clinton as succeeding Euodias in the see of Antioch about A.D. 70.

[1] Rom. xvi. 16 ; 1 Cor. xvi. 20 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 12 ; 1 Thess. v. 26 ; 1 Pet. v. 14.

This is another instance of a deviation from Scripture, which our Reformers unconsciously derived from the corrupt practices of Popery, not indeed in regard to the Priesthood, but to the Laity of the Church.[1]

In conclusion, I must not omit to notice one other point, in regard to which our Reformers' appeal to the Word of God was obviously at fault; I mean their attempt to assert the obligation of the Judicial law of Moses, at least in criminal cases, and consequently "the duty of putting Idolaters (that is, Papists), Adulterers, Witches and Demoniacs, Sabbath-breakers, and several other classes of offenders, to death."[2] It is not necessary to specify instances. They will occur to every one who is familiar with the writings, and the career of Knox.

[1] We shall see in the next chapter that Knox objected to the changing of the *posture* in which the Holy Communion was, apparently, received at its first institution. Ought he not also to have objected to the change in the *time of day* at which it is administered? The Catholic system has ordered both points consistently. See Bishop of Oxford's *Charge*, 1860, p. 14, *seq.*

[2] Hallam's *Constitutional History*, I. 282, 292.

CHAPTER V.

KNOX AND THE ENGLISH REFORMERS.

In order to appreciate thoroughly the grounds of the conclusions exhibited in the foregoing chapter, it is necessary to trace the somewhat ruffled course of Knox's relations with the English Reformers.

That course at its commencement was, for the most part, honourable and beneficial to both parties. Immediately upon his release from the French galleys in the spring of 1549, Knox, thinking it unsafe, or undesirable, to return to this country, landed in England, where he was appointed Preacher by the Privy Council under King Edward VI., first at Berwick, and afterwards at Newcastle. In December 1551, he was made one of the King's (six) chaplains; and as such, in October 1552, was with the rest consulted by Cranmer respecting the Articles of Religion, previously to their ratification by Parliament. In the same month the Duke of Northumberland, writing to Secretary Sir William Cecil, recommended him for the Bishopric of Rochester, then vacant.[1] It is believed, mainly on the authority of Beza, that

[1] Tytler's *England under Edward, etc.*, II. 142.

the offer was made and declined.[1] At Newcastle, it appears that he gave offence by his preaching, and was brought into trouble in several influential quarters. Notwithstanding these complaints, however, he continued to be supported by the King and Privy Council, who, designing to remove him to London, procured for him from Cranmer the offer of the living of All-hallows, Broad Street. But this also he declined; which (together, probably, with certain rumours concerning his proceedings in the North[2]) induced the Council to summon him before them. This was in February 1553. The occasion is a very important one, as it enables us to ascertain what Knox's real feelings were *at this time* towards the English Reformation, and especially towards the English Liturgy. We find the particulars in an abstract, which both Calderwood and Strype have given, of a letter written by Knox himself, under date April 14, of that same year.[3] From the examination he underwent before the Privy Council, it appears that "his refusal to accept the benefice provided for him," arose not from disinclination to use the English Prayer-Book, but because his "conscience did witness that he might profit more *in some other place* than in London;" thus indicating his willingness to accept a benefice elsewhere: and further, it would seem that, in avowing his opinion that "many things at that time were worthy of reformation in

[1] Tytler's *England under Edward, etc.*, II. 141; M'Crie, p. 49, *seq.* 469.

[2] See in the next page, note 2.

[3] Calderwood, I. 280; Strype's *Memorials*, II. Part ii. 72.

the ministry of England," he alluded[1] rather to practical abuses (*e.g.* Pluralities and non-residence in the Clergy), than either to the Episcopal Polity, or to worship and Ceremonies; for the instance which he gave, had reference to the want of discipline, and "authority to separate the lepers from the whole,"—a *desideratum* which the Church of England herself admitted, and still admits and deplores, in the *Office of Commination.* The only other objection which he specified, was, when questioned about kneeling at the Holy Communion. He regarded it as "man's addition and invention," and therefore not so satisfactory as Christ's own "action and example."[2]

Altogether, I am inclined to infer from this examination, and from Knox's conduct generally throughout the period during which he ministered in England (*i.e.*, from the Spring of 1549 to the

[1] For confirmation of the opinion here expressed, see his *Godly Letter to the Faithful in London*, 1554, in which he draws a frightful picture of the sins and disorders prevalent in King Edward's time, even among those who favoured the Reformation, *Works*, III. 175, *seq.*, and his *Confession*, *Ibid.* p. 106; but, especially, the Sermon which he preached at Frankfort, March 1555, where, in order to prove that Religion in England had not, during that reign, been "brought to perfection," he specifies "the want of discipline," and complains that "one man was permitted to have three, four, or five benefices." *Troubles at Frankfort*, p. 39; Knox's *Works*, IV. 83. See also his *Brief Exhortation to England*, 1559; *Ibid.* V. 516-518.

[2] In his *Epistle to the Inhabitants of Newcastle*, dated November 10, 1555, a week before Queen Mary's death, and when, as will be shown in this chapter, a great change had come over Knox's sentiments towards the English Reformation, he boasts that he had "ministered (to them) in all simplicity, not as man hath devised, neither *as the King's proceedings did allow*, the Lord's Table."—*Works*, V. 480. I would rather suppose that he alludes only to kneeling, and therefore expresses himself too largely, than suspect that he acted without his accustomed openness towards the Privy Council. But compare the Duke of Northumberland's letter, referred to above, p. 107.

Autumn of 1553, nearly five years), that the writers who speak[1] of his "*consistent* hatred of the English Ritual," of his having "*always* evinced strong aversion to the English Service Book," and of "his *conscientious scruples* as to the Divine authority of the Episcopal order, leading him to reject promotion in the Sister Church," have drawn their conclusions somewhat too hastily, and under the influence of an *anachronism* which has ascribed to him sentiments at this period such as he undoubtedly entertained afterwards, from the effect, as I believe, of disappointment and of provocations which were due in great measure to his own injudicious and intemperate conduct. Of this I shall speak presently. In the meantime, in order to show that he did not "*always* evince *strong aversion* to the English Service Book," we have only to produce his own words, spoken at *Frankfort* in March 1555, and recorded by himself. "I HAD ONCE A GOOD OPINION OF THE BOOK; but . . . afterwards, by the stubbornness of such men as would defend the whole, and *the deeper consideration of the damage that might ensue thereof*, and by contemplation of our estate which *requireth* ALL OUR DOINGS to have open defence of the Scriptures (especially *in God's Service to admit nothing without God's Word*), I was driven away from my first opinion."[2] In like manner, to explain his non-

[1] See Hardwick's *Reformation*, p. 149. Editor of Knox's *Works*, III. 79. Principal Tulloch, p. 348, 350, 362. M'Crie, p. 27, 49, 263. No writer has been more misled upon Knox's opinion respecting Episcopacy than Tytler. See his *History*, VI. 151, 296, 325; and compare Cook, II. 379.

[2] *Works*, III. 43.

acceptance of preferment in England, we have also his own express assurance, which is infinitely more trustworthy than the suspicious statement of Beza, published many years afterwards. In a treatise addressed to Mrs. Bowes, in February 1554, speaking of the dismal reverse after King Edward's death, he then reveals his true motive :—

" How oft have you and I talked of these present days, till neither of us both could refrain tears, *when no such appearance then* was seen of man! How oft have I said unto you that I looked daily for trouble, and that I wondered at it, that so long I should escape it! What *moved me to refuse* (and that with displeasure of all men, even of those that best loved me) *those high promotions* that were offered by him whom God hath taken from us for our offences? ASSUREDLY THE FORESIGHT OF TROUBLE TO COME. How oft have I said unto you, that the time would not be long that England would give me bread."[1] Here we find *a strong presentiment*, under which, as on other critical occasions, Knox confesses that he shaped his course; but we discover *no ground whatever* for the assertion that " conscientious scruples as to the divine authority of the Episcopal order, and his general dissatisfaction with the state of Ecclesi-

[1] See M'Crie, p. 55. He, and others who have followed him, have scarcely done justice to this testimony. His reference is as follows :—" MS. Letters, p. 73, 74, also p. 250." The passage occurs in Knox's *Exposition of the 6th Psalm of David*. *Works*, III. 122. Similar declarations by Knox of his anticipating, in King Edward's time, that " superstition, lies, and idolatry would prevail and have the upper hand," and the Gospel be again withdrawn, and foreign tyranny set up, are to be found elsewhere. See *Works*, v. 479-489; III. 288, 321, 326, 356, 371; IV. 220.

astical affairs in England, led him to reject this (a Bishopric) as well as any other promotion in the Sister Church." [1]

After Mary's accession, in July 1553, Knox remained in England rather more than six months; liberty having been granted to retain the Reformed worship till the 20th of December. He continued to preach, chiefly in Buckinghamshire, till the beginning of November. No sooner had he quitted England, for Dieppe, January 20, 1554, than he began to write and publish addresses, more or less elaborate, in the form of Warnings and Exhortations, to those whom he had *left behind;* not without incurring much bitter self-reproach, for that, as he confessed, "in the beginning of this battle he had appeared to play the faint-hearted and feeble soldier." [2] His first address was *A Godly Letter to the Faithful in London, Newcastle, and Berwick, and to all others within the realm of England that love the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ;* and bears date, in the first edition, May 8, 1554. The main purport of this letter was to deter the faithful from being present at, or in any way countenancing the Mass,—now set

[1] It may be added that the Reforming Preachers appear to have spoken in their public discourses somewhat too sharply, and *much too personally*—and none more so than Knox; till at length the Council would bear it no longer. This we are told by Knox himself. "The whole Council said they would hear no more of their sermons; they were but indifferent fellows; yea, and some of them eschewed not to call them 'prating knaves." *Works*, III. 177; compare *Ibid.* p. 280, *seq.*

[2] See *Exposition of . Sixth Psalm. Works*, III. 154. At a later period, however, when he wrote so severely to those who had fallen back in Queen Mary's time, he did not scruple to justify his own course. See *Works*, V. 514. "I do ever *except* such as . . . by avoiding the realm . . . did give testimony," etc. etc. See also IV. 247.

up again—on the ground of its Idolatry. This was speedily followed by two shorter addresses, viz., *An Epistle to his Afflicted Brethren in England,* dated May 10, 1554, and *A Comfortable Epistle sent to the Afflicted Church of Christ,* and which is in part a repetition of its predecessor, though considerably enlarged. It is dated May 31st, of the same year. Towards the conclusion of the former, there had occurred the following *significant* hints :—"If I thought that I might have your presence, and the presence of some other assured men, I would jeopard my own life to let men see what may be done *with a safe conscience* in these dolorous and dangerous days, but seeing that *it cannot be done instantly* without danger to others than to me, I will abide the time that God shall appoint. But hereof be assured, that all is not lawful nor just that is statute by civil law, neither yet is *everything Sin before God which ungodly persons allege to be Treason.*"[1] Whether it was his own conscience, or the expostulation of friends, which brought him to see that writing such as this was not defensible, we may probably attribute the appearance, so soon after, of the second version of the Epistle to his desire to cancel and recall the former; for, instead of any such language as that just now quoted, we find in the latter address the following truly Christian advice :—"In the mean season, Beloved Brethren, two things ye must avoid. The former that ye *presume not to be revengers of your own cause,* but that ye resign over vengeance

[1] *Works,* III. 235, *seq.*

unto Him who only is able to requite them according to their malicious minds. Secondly, that ye hate not with any carnal hatred those blind, cruel, and malicious tyrants, but that ye learn of Christ *to pray for your persecutors;* lamenting and bewailing that the Devil should so prevail against them, that headlong they should run, body and soul, to perpetual perdition."[1]

But this wiser and more temperate mood was but of short duration. It gave place to an explosion coarser, more violent, and more offensive to the highest authorities, both civil and ecclesiastical, than any which had preceded it. I allude to *A faithful Admonition made by John Knox unto the Professors of God's Truth in England*, which appeared July 20th, 1554, and of which one main object was to point out the danger that must arise from the projected marriage of Queen Mary with Philip of Spain, which was solemnized only five days afterwards. It has been frankly admitted, even by so friendly a witness as the learned Editor of Knox's Works, that this publication was attended with the most unhappy consequences. Mr. Laing's words are these: "There can be no hesitation in believing that the obnoxious terms applied (in this *Admonition*) to Queen Mary[2] and to her husband, as well as to Gardiner, Bonner, and the Marquis of Winchester, may have contri-

[1] *Ibid.* p. 244.

[2] To give one, and by no means the most offensive specimen:—"Jezebel herself shall not escape the vengeance and plagues that are prepared for her portion. The flatterers and the maintainers of her abominations shall drink the cup of God's wrath with her."—*Faithful Admonition, etc.* Knox's *Works*, III. 329.

buted, in no small degree, to evoke that spirit of persecution[1] which has so indelibly stamped the character of blood on her reign."

It is sad indeed to think that such may have been the fact. And whether it was really so or not, it is certain that such an impression had gone abroad. In a letter addressed to Calvin by Whitehead (Pastor), Cox, Becon, and others of the English congregation at Frankfort, of date September 20, 1555, we read as follows :—" This we can assure you, that that outrageous pamphlet of Knox's (*The Faithful Admonition*) added much oil to the flame of persecution in England. For before the publication of that book *not one of our brethren had suffered death ;* but *as soon as it came forth*, we doubt not but that you are well aware of the number of excellent men who have perished in the flames ; to say nothing of how many other godly men besides have been exposed to the risk of all their property, and even life itself, *upon the sole ground of having either had this book in their possession or having read it.*"[2]

Nor was this the only baneful result. Other leaders of the English Reformation began to feel—if not, that Knox was taking too much upon himself—yet, at least, that he was *mismanaging their cause.* In that same letter written from Frankfort, it appears that such persons were now unwilling to be seen in

[1] Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer were condemned for heresy on the 20th of April 1554, but the sentence was not executed till October 16, 1555.

[2] *Original Letters*, P. Soc. II. 761. Cox had been King Edward's preceptor ; Becon, Cranmer's chaplain.

Knox's company from fear of consequences. "They considered it neither profitable nor safe to ourselves that Knox should be received with favour by our Church."[1] He had been invited from Geneva (whither he had removed from Dieppe towards the end of July 1554) to become one of their ministers, by the English exiles at Frankfort, and had arrived there accordingly in October. It was stipulated by the Magistrates, who allowed to these English the joint use of the French Protestant Church in that city, "that the service should be conducted *as nearly as possible after the manner of the French Church*, which corresponded closely with the forms practised at Geneva." On consulting, however, with their fellow-countrymen, but now fellow-exiles, at Zurich, Strasbourg, and elsewhere, the Frankfort Congregation were strongly dissuaded from adopting any other forms of worship than those which had been set forth in the English Prayer-Book. Hence controversy arose, and the party of Knox and Whittingham,[2] who, being less favourable to the use of the Liturgy, were naturally more inclined to insist upon the *requirement of the Magistrates*,[3] desired to refer the dispute to Calvin. With this view they transmitted to him a descriptive Summary of the Prayer-Book, which

[1] *Ibid.* p. 760.

[2] The influence of Whittingham, and still more of Goodman, with whom Knox was associated at Geneva, appears to have had an injurious effect upon the mind of our Reformer.

[3] The Magistrates, however, appear to have acted very liberally and impartially in the matter. The English were not so bound down to the ritual of the French, but that if the latter allowed of what was done by the former, it was sufficient. It was this liberality which opened the door for the contention of the exiles among themselves.

they had prepared, in Latin. In executing this task, however, it will be admitted by any one who has examined the draft which they sent, they did not act with *perfect good faith.* For example, the Litany is described as "certain suffrages, devised of Pope Gregory, which begin after this manner, *O God the Father* of Heaven, etc., *O God the Son,* etc., only leaving out the Invocation of Saints; otherwise we use *a certain conjuring of God, by the mystery of His Incarnation, by His holy Nativity and Circumcision,* etc.; yea, it comprehendeth in plain words a prayer to be *delivered from sudden death;* the people answering to the end of every clause, either *Spare us, good Lord,* or else, *Good Lord, deliver us,* or, *We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.* . . . . Passing over some things, lest we should seem to sift *all those drosses* which remain still among us." There are other instances of similar and even worse disparagement, evidently designed to prejudice Calvin's mind. For instance: "To these is joined their manner of marriage, of which, that we pass over many petty ceremonies, *these follies who can suffer?* The husband layeth down a ring, etc. etc." The answer of Calvin is well known. "In Anglicanâ Liturgiâ, *qualem describitis,* multas video fuisse *tolerabiles ineptias.*"[1] Had it been *described* to him in a fairer and more impartial manner, he might have expressed himself otherwise.

[1] The reader will observe that these last words convey not so much an expression of Calvin's own judgment against the Prayer Book, as a rebuke to his correspondents. They had said "these follies *who can tolerate!*" He answers by speaking of them as quite "*tolerable.*"

Meanwhile the controversy was mixed up with personal jealousies and disagreements, which tended to aggravate what there was of real differences of opinion. And of these causes of mutual animosity there was probably none which had a more injurious effect than that to which I have already referred, viz., the publication by Knox of his *Admonition*, and the consequences in England to which it was supposed to have led, and which must by this time —the beginning of 1555—have been well known at Frankfort. The chief party among the Exiles at first endeavoured to persuade Knox to withdraw. But this he declined to do. To give the words of their own relation, written to Calvin, "Not succeeding in this, our friends, having more closely considered *the danger which without doubt was hanging over them*, thought it right to proceed in a different way. The matter was at last brought before the Magistrates, with no other view than that *Knox might be ordered to quit the place*. When the Magistrate was made acquainted with the case, and had also discovered that *the Emperor was defamed in that Pamphlet*, considering that a man of this kind might easily occasion danger, not only to our Church, but also to his State, he ordered him to leave the city."[1] Accordingly, he did so, on March 26, and returned to Geneva.

It is easy to imagine that treatment such as this must have caused no slight or transient offence to a

[1] *Original Letters*, P. Soc. p. 760. Strype's *Memorials*, vol. III. Pt. i. 406, *seq.* See also Knox's *Works*, I. 232; IV. 38, 46-49, 63.

man of Knox's magisterial temperament; nor would he be likely to reflect, in any penitential mood, that he had, in great measure, brought it upon himself. Among those who joined in the complaint made against him to the Magistrates was not only Cox, afterwards Bishop of Ely, but the still more eminent future Bishop of Salisbury,—Jewell. In short, his rupture with the leading English Reformers began from this time, and was never afterwards completely healed.[1] It had the unhappy effect of throwing him more into the arms first of Calvin, and afterwards of Beza. And worse than this; it led him to regard the English Reformation and the English Liturgy with far less sympathy and admiration, and certain things in both with far more dislike and bitterness, than he had formerly done. There is indeed a striking and painful contrast to be traced between the terms in which he spoke on these subjects in 1554, before the Frankfort Troubles, and the language which he used the following year, shortly previous to his leaving that city; and still more the language which he used in the beginning of 1559, about four years afterwards. In his *Admonition*, written (July 1554) before he went to Frankfort, speaking of King Edward's reign, he had admitted that "God gave boldness and knowledge to the Court of Parliament to take away the most part of superstitions (kneeling at the Lord's Supper excepted) which before profaned Christ's true Religion."[2] Here it would seem

[1] See the *Diary* of Bishop Lesley, while a prisoner in England, 1571. *Bannatyne Miscellany*, III. 143, quoted by the Editor of Knox's *Works*, v. 3.

[2] *Works*, III. 279.

that *with one exception*—the same which Knox had objected to when he was in England[1]—there was little to complain of in the English Prayer-Book. So far then all is consistent,—but certainly *not* "consistent *hatred* of the English ritual." Let us now see how he expressed himself, in a Sermon which he preached the next year (March 1555), a fortnight before he left Frankfort. "I do find in the English Book . . . things *superstitious, impure, unclean,* and *imperfect.*"[2] But a greater change still had taken place, not in the book itself, for it remained the same, but in Knox's sentiments regarding it, on the last occasion to which I just now referred. "A portion of the *mark of the Beast* are all those *dregs of Papistry* which were left in your great Book of England, one jot whereof will I never counsel any man to use: one jot, I say, of these *Diabolical* inventions, viz., crossing in Baptism, kneeling at the Lord's Table, mummelling or singing of the Litany, etc. *The whole order of your Book appeareth rather to be devised for upholding of massing Priests* than for *any good instruction* which the simple People can thereof receive."[3] Thus he wrote

[1] See above, p. 109.

[2] *Troubles at Frankfort*, p. 38. Knox's *Works*, IV. 32 *seq.*, 44. With regard to the "imperfectness" which Knox complained of, it must be remembered that one of the chief objections then felt against the Prayer-Book,—viz., the want of longer and more substantive prayers, in comparison with other and especially the *responsive* parts of the service,—has since been remedied by the addition not only of the *General Thanksgiving*, but of the *four*, and when Parliament sits, *five* previous *Collects of Intercession*. Before these additions were made, the service (except when the Litany was used) might well have appeared meagre in the department of direct and sustained supplication.

[3] *Calderwood*, I. 431, *seq.*

(April 6, 1559) to Mrs. Anne Locke, an English lady, "from a mind," as Strype observes, "sufficiently embittered against the English Reformation." And yet not so much embittered *against the English Reformation* as on other accounts. Quoting a portion of the same letter afterwards, Strype adds, "This is enough to show the hot spirit of this man, and the prejudice he had, *for some cause or other*, conceived against this Church and Kingdom, where he had once been kindly harboured."[1]

The "cause" indeed is sufficiently obvious. About a year before this letter was written, Knox had committed another, and still more obnoxious and unhappy blunder, than the *Epistle to his Afflicted Brethren*, or even than the *Faithful Admonition*. Early in 1558 he had published, at Geneva, his *First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*. This publication was directed against the reigning Queen Mary of England, and the Regent Queen-Dowager (Mary of Loraine) of Scotland. The former died Nov. 17th of the same year. The latter, June 10th, 1560. Could Knox have foreseen these events, and especially the first, which made way for the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the English throne, as the second did for the return of Mary Queen of Scots from France, there is little doubt that the work, as it never was completed, so it would never have been undertaken. Unhappily

"Nescit vox missa reverti;"

and Knox was not a man, as I have said, frankly

[1] Strype, *Annals*, I. Part i. 177.

to confess an error, however he might see and regret the difficulties into which it brought him. In the present case the difficulties were, for a time, of the most serious kind; and though willing, as he showed himself on several subsequent occasions (as in his letter to Queen Elizabeth, July 20, 1559, and in his first interview with Queen Mary, August 26, 1561) to make something like concessions,[1] he never consented to do what was necessary in order fully to extricate himself from the consequences of this disastrous step. If his *Admonition* had compelled the English exiles at Frankfort to separate themselves from his company, and to procure his banishment from that city, his *Blast of the Trumpet* had alienated them still farther, now that they were, by God's blessing, returned home. This appears plainly by his own confession in the letter before quoted. "It is written to me," he says to his correspondent, "that my first Blast hath *blown from me all my Friends* in England." And again, in his letter to Cecil, written from Perth, June 28, 1559, his own words are, that he had made "Queen Elizabeth, and the Faithful in England, his enemies."[2] So much indeed was this the case, that when, in January 1559, he had applied to the English Government for permission to pass through the country, with the

[1] *Works*, II. 28, 277; Calderwood, I. 435. In writing (May 15, 1555) to John Fox who "in a loving and friendly letter" had expostulated with him on the impropriety of the publication, he admits, "his rude vehemency and inconsidered affirmations, which may appear rather to proceed from choler than of zeal and reason." See *Works*, IV. 352; v. 5.

[2] Tytler, VI. 131; compare 151, *seq.*

intention of visiting his Friends at Newcastle and Berwick, on his way to Scotland, his request was peremptorily refused! The subject is a painful one, and I will not dwell upon it. That there was sufficient ground for the offence taken cannot be denied.[1] Even Calvin and Beza both highly disapproved of Knox's publication. The former condemns it as "the thoughtless arrogance of one individual."[2] The latter informs us that it was not permitted to be sold at Geneva.[3]

After circumstances such as I have explained, it is not wonderful that Knox—when called upon in 1660 to take the leading part in reconstructing the Church of this country—should have been inclined to look for the model of his procedure anywhere rather than to England. Nor shall we now perhaps feel so much surprise at the more than questionable boast that "our Reformers took not their pattern from any Kirk in the world, no, not from *Geneva itself*."[4]

It remains to mention the two last English addresses of Knox—viz., his *Epistle to the Inhabitants of Newcastle and Berwick, and unto all other who sometime in the realm of England professed Christ Jesus, and now be returned to the bondage of Idolatry,* dated November 10, 1558; and his *Brief Exhortation to the Realm of England, and to all Estates*

[1] See Strype's *Life of Aylmer*, p. 150. "They (the Papists) continued industriously to make a noise against *the whole body of the English Protestants*, for that single book of Knox's, however disowned and abhorred by them."

[2] *Zurich Letters*, 2d Series. P. Soc. p. 35.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 131. Strype's *Annals*, I. Pt. i. 173.

[4] See above, p. 24, *seq.*

within the same, for the speedy embracing of Christ's Gospel, dated January 12, 1559. As in the case of his first two publications of this kind—*The Godly Letter* and *the Comfortable Epistle* of 1554—the over-hasty, ill-judged, and, as the event proved, most untimely utterances of the former of these addresses, rendered the appearance of the latter, so soon after, necessary for the author's credit; his predictions of all manner of evil to England having been so signally falsified by Queen Mary's death (on November 17th), within a week after they had been given to the world. For example: "If ye be not more than blind, ye may evidently see the potent hand of God displayed and stretched out against you." And again: "Seeing that God's Judgments ye cannot escape, humble yourselves betimes, before that his vengeance be armed to your destruction."[1] After expressions such as these, well might he avow in his *Brief Exhortation to England*, "In very deed, when in dolour of heart I wrote the former letter, I neither looked nor could believe that the *Lord Jesus would so suddenly knock at thy gate.*" And so he proceeds shortly after: "When I did *more deeply* weigh that such is the infinite goodness of God, etc. etc. etc., I was in judgment *somewhat reformed.*"[2]

There is one important passage in the *Brief Exhortation*, which has been already partly quoted in the foregoing Discourse.[3] It proves, I think, indisputably, the observation made at the commencement of this chapter,[4] viz., that writers who speak of

[1] Knox's *Works*, v. 490, 492.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 503, *seq.*
[3] See above, p. 27, *seq.*
[4] See above, p. 110.

Knox as *conscientiously objecting to Episcopal Government* have drawn their conclusions too hastily. Had he entertained any such objection, we may feel quite sure that nothing would have prevented him from expressing it at a time when so much had occurred to alienate him from the English Reformers, and in an address, of which the main object was to urge the carrying out of Reformation in England upon principles of uncompromising Discipline, and of the *strictest adherence to the letter of Holy Scripture.* Knox was now in his fifty-fourth year. He had ministered for five years, continuously, in England, and, after that, for the same period, with only one interruption, of nine or ten months,[1] on the Continent. And what is the result of his study and of his experience during all this time? Having laid down as the *first thing* requisite, "that the Religion and true honouring of God may be at once brought to that purity which His Word requireth," what does he recommend? That Episcopacy be abolished as Popish and un-Scriptural, and that Presbyterianism, as required by the Word of God, be set up in its stead? No! His words are these :—

"Let no man be charged in preaching of Christ Jesus above that which one man may do; I mean that *your Bishoprics be so divided,* that of every one as they be now (for the most part) be made ten. . . . For your proud Prelates' great dominions, and charges *impossible by one man to be discharged,* are no part of Christ's ministry, but are the maintenance

[1] Viz., in 1555-56, when he visited Scotland.

of the tyranny first invented and yet retained by the Roman Antichrist."[1]

It is well known that great efforts are being made at the present time in England to bring about a subdivision of Dioceses, not indeed to such an extent as Knox here proposes, but upon the very same principle; that *no Bishop be charged above that which one man may do who desires faithfully to fulfil his "part of Christ's ministry."*

I have already mentioned that the chief authority upon which it is stated, by Dr. M'Crie and others, that Knox refused an English Bishopric, is Beza, who, in his *Icones*, published in 1580, has the following passage:—"Quum Episcopatus quidam offerretur, tantum abest ut illum receperit, ut etiam in totam illam *verè Satanicam* potestatem graviter sit invectus."

I leave it to the impartial reader now to determine how much weight is to be attached to this assertion.

I will only add to these notices, that whatever degree of alienation sprang up unhappily between Knox and the English Reformers, it did not prevent his two sons from being educated at Cambridge, and ordained to the ministry of the English Church.

[1] *Works*, v. 515, 518, *seq.*

CHAPTER VI.

DEFECTS OF REFORMATION DUE ORIGINALLY TO EXCESSES OF POPERY.

THERE is nothing which tends to throw more light upon the whole Reformation movement than the subject which is now to be brought (briefly and imperfectly) under the reader's notice. And I cannot introduce it better than by the following extracts from the celebrated *History of the Council of Trent* by Paolo Sarpi, or Father Paul, of whom, though he continued a Romanist to the last, the estimation entertained among Protestants may be gathered from the testimonies which are given in the note below.[1] The historian is recording the proceedings of the Council in the year 1546, when the subject of the then existing relations of Bishops to their own flocks on the one hand, and to the Pope on the other, was first broached :—

"In treating of the Lectures and Sermons, there

[1] "One of the late miracles of mankind for general learning, prudence, and modesty, Padre Paulo ; a man whose fame must never die, till virtue and learning shall become so useless as not to be regarded."—Bishop Sanderson, *Works*, VI. 326. "Paolo Sarpi, one who, in my judgment, understood more of the liberal spirit of the Gospel, and the genuine character of the Christian Institutions, than any writer of his age."—Principal Campbell, *Lectures on Eccles. Hist.* I. 82.

was a general complaint of [by] the *Bishops,* especially *Spanish,* that Christ having commanded that His doctrine should be taught, which is exercised in the Church by preaching, and reading [Lectures] to the more capacious, that they may be fit to teach the people, the care to superintend over all that exercise these functions, ought to be proper to the Bishop. That the Apostles have so instituted, and the Holy Fathers so practised. That now *this office is absolutely taken from the Bishops by privileges* [of the Pope and others] *so that no jot thereof remaineth.* That this is the cause why *all is out of order,* because the order instituted by Christ is changed. The Universities are withdrawn with exemptions, that the Bishop cannot know what they teach; *the Sermons are by privilege given to the Friars,* who *by no means acknowledge the Bishop nor suffer him to meddle,* so that the office of a Pastor is quite taken from the Bishops. And on the contrary, those who anciently were appointed to weep for sins [Monks and Friars], and expressly and severely forbid to preach and teach, have assumed this power unto them, or, at the least, it is given them for their *proper functions.* And so the flock remaineth without either Shepherd or hireling, because these ambulatory Preachers, who to-day are in one city, to-morrow in another, know neither the need nor the capacity of the people, and least of all the occasions to teach and edify them as doth the proper Pastor, who liveth always with the flock, and knoweth the necessities and infirmities of it. Besides, the end of those Preachers

is *not to edify* but to *take alms* either for themselves or their cloisters, which, that they may the better obtain, they aim not to benefit the soul, but to delight the ear, and soothe men in their pleasures, that thereby they may draw more profit; and the people, instead of learning the doctrine of Christ, learneth either novity or vanity at the least. That the abuse of the *Pardoners* was the more manifest, who go about *preaching indulgences*, whose scandals, formerly given, cannot be related without tears. That it is a clear case, that they exhort the people to nothing but to give money. The only remedy for these disorders is to take away all *the privileges* [*i.e.*, given to and by the Pope] and restore to the Bishops the charge to teach and preach, and to elect those for their fellow-labourers whom they shall know worthy of that ministry, and disposed to exercise it with charity.[1]

"On the contrary side, the Generals of the *Regulars* and others said, that the Bishops and Curates having wholly abandoned the office of a Pastor, so that for many hundreds of years the people remained without sermons in the Church and without the doctrine of Divinity in Schools, God hath raised the begging Orders to supply these necessary ministries, into which notwithstanding they intruded not themselves, but entered by the grant of *the supreme Pastor* [*i.e.*, the Pope]; unto whom it principally

[1] In further confirmation and illustration of these complaints, see Field, *Of the Church*, Book v. c. 55. "*Of the Popes' disordered intermeddling, . . . their usurpation, intrusion, and prejudicing the rights and liberty of others.*"

appertaining to feed *all the flock of Christ,* it cannot be said that men deputed by him, to supply the defects of him that had the care of the flock and did abandon it, have usurped the office of another. But it may be said that if they had not used that charity, there had now remained no sign of Christianity. Now that they have applied themselves *more than three hundred years to that holy work, with such fruit as appeareth,* they have prescribed [*i.e.,* obtained a *prescriptive right* to] those functions and made them their own, by a lawful title, given by the chief Pastor, the Bishop of Rome; and that the Bishops *have no lawful right unto them,* nor can allege the use of antiquity to regain that office, which so many hundred years since they have forsaken. That they have a desire of gaining for themselves, or their monasteries, is a mere calumny, because the alms are gathered only for their necessary food and apparel, and the residue being spent for the worship of God, in Masses, buildings and ornaments of Churches, turneth to the benefit and edification of the people, and not to their own profit; that the services done by their Orders to the holy Church, and doctrine of Divinity (which is nowhere to be found but in their cloisters) deserve the continuance of that charge which others are not able to exercise.

"The [Papal] Legates, importuned by both parties, by the counsel of their most inward friends resolved to relate to Rome, and expect an answer. The Pope referred it to the Congregation [of Cardinals]; where presently it was seen whither the pretence of

the Bishops tended; that is, to make themselves so many Popes in their Dioceses. For when the Pope's privilege and exemption should be removed, and every one should depend on them, and none on the Pope, *all cause of going to Rome would cease.* They considered that the Popes have anciently had for *a principal secret* to preserve the Primacy given them by Christ, to *exempt* the Bishops from the Archbishop, the Abbots from the Bishops, and so to oblige men to defend him [the Pope]. That it is a clear case, that after the six hundreth year, the Primacy of the Apostolic See hath been upheld by the *Benedictine monks* exempted, and after, by the Congregations of *Cluny* and *Cistercium*, and other *monastical assemblies*, until God raised the *mendicant Orders*, by which it hath been maintained until now. Wherefore to take away their *privileges* were *directly to oppugn the Papacy*, and not those Orders; to remove the *exemptions* were a manifest *depression of the Court of Rome*, because they should want means to keep a Bishop within compass that he exalt not himself too high. Therefore, that the Pope and Court were compelled by necessity to maintain the *Friars' cause.* But to do these things smoothly, they considered also that it was necessary *to conceal this reason;* and they resolved to answer the Legates that by all means they should preserve the state of the Regulars, and cause *the Bishops to surcease*, setting before them the excessive number of Friars, and the credit which they have with the people, and advise them to take a moderate course, and not

make a Schism, by desiring too much. That it was just they should receive *some satisfaction,* but they should also be content to give it; and when they came to the point, they should grant anything concerning the Pardoners, but should do nothing concerning the Friars, without communicating it to the Generals, and should give the Bishops some satisfaction, which might not take away *the privileges.* That they should do the like for the Universities, because *it was necessary that both these and those should depend on the Pope and* NOT *on the Bishops.*" —Brett's Translation, p. 158-160.

In the following year, 1547, the same matter was again brought before the Council, upon the question of *Residence.*

"In this it was not so easy to agree, because the Legates and their adherents had contrary ends to the other Bishops. These [the Bishops] began to hope and to aim, almost all, but especially the *Spaniards,* to regain the Episcopal Authority, which anciently every one did exercise in his own Diocese, when *the reservations of Benefices, of Cases, or of Absolutions, Dispensations, and the like, were unknown;* which they were wont to say in private discourse, when few were present, that ambition and avarice had made proper to the Court of Rome, under a feigned colour to manage them better and more to the public service of God and the Church, throughout all Christendom, than the Bishops could do in their own cities, in regard of their imperfection and ignorance. But it was not so, because dissolution and ignorance

did not enter into the Episcopal order until they were compelled to go as servants to Rome. But if bad government were then seen in the Bishops, which caused their authority to be taken away, now it may be seen to be worst of all in the Court of Rome; so that by the same reason, that management ought to be taken away, which is not proper to it but much abused by it.

"The decree, that *residency* was required by the law of God, was esteemed by these Prelates *the best remedy for the disease past and preservative against it hereafter.* For if God hath commanded Bishops to reside perpetually with the flock, it followeth necessarily that He hath also prescribed them the charge, and given them power to exercise it well. Therefore the Pope cannot call them, or busie them in ought else, nor dispense with them, nor restrain their authority given them by God. Therefore they desired to proceed to the determination, saying, it was necessary to resolve the article, because it was sufficiently discussed. The Cardinal of *Monte* having premeditated before, let them speak who were most earnest, that part of the heat might exhale; then *he opposed himself dexterously,*" etc.—*Ibid.* p. 217.

In consequence of this opposition by the Pope's Legate, *John Maria di Monte,* afterwards Pope Julius III., nothing was determined at that time. But in 1551, the matter was resumed, with reference, again, to the question of residence.

"Afterwards they discoursed of the Reformation;

which because it was to take away the cause why Bishops *do not reside,* many [things] were repeated, some proposed before in *Trent* and *Bolonia,* and some then first spoken of. Finally, they insisted on Jurisdiction, saying that *the Bishops were wholly deprived of it,* partly by avocation of Causes, and partly by Appeals, but especially by Exemptions; yea, that *more often jurisdiction was exercised over and against them by their subjects,* either by special commission from Rome, or by virtue of Conservatories, than by them over their subjects. And Fathers were elected to frame the articles concerning this matter."—*Ibid.* p. 304. See also p. 550, *seq.,* concerning what passed in 1562.

These extracts enable us to understand the readiness with which our Reformers suffered themselves to set aside the authority of their local Bishops, from the previous aggressions to which it had been exposed, and from the general ignorance which prevailed respecting it. The following passage from a Discourse of the learned and acute Charles Leslie, will inform us that the design of the Pope's party, however dexterously managed, was not altogether successful. The fact is, the Spanish Bishops, though they ultimately yielded, did so with the understanding that the words of the Decree of the Council should be so chosen as to leave them at liberty to reproduce their arguments at any future time.[1] The

[1] See Hardwick's *Reformation,* p. 320. The "future time," so far as regards any settlement of the chief matter in dispute, has never arrived. "The claims advanced by the Cisalpine School have never been, and never will be decided; whether (to use the

decree as it now stands—Canons vii. viii. De Ordine—ultimately passed at the 23d Session of the Council, 15th of July 1668.[1]

"Episcopacy has none so great an enemy as the Papacy, which would engross the whole Episcopal power into the single see of Rome, by making all other Bishops absolutely dependent upon that which only they call *the Apostolical Chair*. And no longer since than the Council of Trent, the Pope endeavoured, with all his interest, to have Episcopacy, except only that of the Bishop of Rome, to be declared *not* to be *jure divino;* by which *no other Bishops could claim any other power but what they had from him*.[2] But that Council was not so quite degenerated as to suffer this to pass.

"And the Jesuits and others who disputed there on the Pope's part, used those same arguments against the Divine right of Episcopacy, which from

phrase of the Trent Disputants) Bishops be *jure Divino*, or *jure Pontificio;* whether they have their commission from God or from the Pope; whether, in fine, the Pope be not the only true Bishop in the world, employing all others as his Deputies or Vicars: these are questions to which the Roman Catholic Church, notwithstanding her store of infallible traditions, *must not dare to give an answer*. Virtually, and in practice, though not in terms, the questions have been decided by the Pope, and, of course, in his own favour."—*Digest of Evidence before Parliament, on the State of Ireland*, 1824-1825, by Phelan and O'Sullivan. Part ii. p. 103.

[1] See Father Paul's *History*, p. 690, *seq.*

[2] Among the reasons given why the Reformers were slow to admit the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, the recent Editor of Hooker's works reckons the following:—"Add to this, what the Papacy itself had done and was daily doing to *weaken all notions of independent authority in Bishops;* of which policy the full development may be seen in the proceedings of the Italian party at Trent, and their efforts to obtain an express declaration from the Council that *no Prelate had any power in the Church, except what he received through the Successors of St. Peter.*"—*Preface* to Hooker, I. p. lx.

them, and the Popish Canonists and Schoolmen, have been taken up by our Dissenters.

"When the Pope could not carry his cause against Episcopacy in the Council of Trent, he took another method, and that was, to set up a vast number of Presbyterian Priests, that is, the Regulars, whom he exempted from the jurisdiction of their respective Bishops, and framed them into a method and discipline of their own, accountable to *Superiors* of his and their own contriving.

"These usurpations upon the Episcopal authority made the famous Archbishop of Spalatro quit his great preferments in the Church of Rome, and travel into England, in the reign of James I., to seek for a more primitive and independent Episcopacy. Himself, in his *Consilium Profectionis*, gives these same reasons for it; and that this shameful depression and prostitution of Episcopacy in the Church of Rome was the cause of his leaving her.

"He observed truly, that the further we search upward in antiquity there is still more to be found of the Episcopal, and less of the Papal Eminency.

"St. Ignatius is full in every line almost of the high authority of the Bishop, next and immediately under Christ, as all the other Writers in those primitive times; but there is a profound silence in them all of that Supremacy in the Bishop of Rome which is now claimed over all the other Bishops of the Catholic Church, which could not be if it had been then known in the world. This had been a short and effectual method whereby St. Paul and

St. Clement might have quieted the great schism of the Corinthians against which they both wrote in their Epistles to them, to bid them refer their difficulties to the infallible judge of controversy, the supreme Pastor at Rome. But not a word like this; especially considering that St. Peter was one for whom some of these Corinthians strove (1 Cor. i. 12) against those who preferred others before him. . . .

"So very groundless as well as malicious is that popular clamour of Episcopacy having any relation to Popery. They are so utterly irreconcilable, that it is impossible they can stand together; for that moment that Episcopacy were restored to its primitive independency, the Papacy, that is, that Supremacy which does now distinguish it, must *ipso facto* cease."—*Works*, VII. 125-127.

In the meantime, however, it is to be observed, the policy of the Popes, by the aid first of the Schoolmen, and afterwards of the Jesuits, had so far succeeded, that the doubts which they had raised respecting the Episcopate as a distinct *Order* in the Ministry, do not seem to have been thoroughly cleared up till the discovery of the genuine Epistles of Ignatius towards the middle of the sixteenth century. Hence it is that we find English Divines, previous to that time, such as Hooker, Field, and Mede, speaking of the Clergy as being of only *two Orders*, though of *three Degrees*.[1] And this perhaps will help

[1] See Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.* Book v. c. lxxviii. 2, 9, 12. Field, *Of the Church*, Book v. c. xxvii. Mede, *Disc.* v. *Works*, p. 26. Bishop Andrewes, however, showed that the pretended distinction between *Order* and *Degree* was not founded in Scripture or the Fathers. *Opusc. Posth.* p. 183. And Bramhall thought it a matter of indif-

to account for the arrangement laid down in the first Book of Discipline of *Superintendents* and *Ministers*; as it is certain there are other things in that Book which may receive explanation from the foregoing narrative of Father Paul.[1] But since the time just now specified, the great English Theologians have never hesitated to speak of the *Three Orders* of Clergy with the same precision which, by a wonderful Providence, their Reformers of the preceding Century used in the Preface to the offices of Ordination; though in the offices themselves they so far betray the influence of the Papal and Scholastic arguments as to employ the term *Ordering* (for *Ordaining*) only of Deacons and Priests, and the term *Consecration*[2] of Bishops: and the Reader who desires to see the whole matter argued, may consult the *Theological Determination* which the most eminent of the Post-Restoration Divines, Bishop Pearson, delivered upon the point as Margaret Professor at Cambridge; in which he proves, against the arguments of the Schoolmen, "Ordinem esse Episcopalem ab aliis Ordinibus distinctum." I quote a few words from the commencement of the argument, in justification

ference. "It is not at all material whether Episcopacy and Priesthood be two distinct Orders, or distinct Degrees of the same Order, the one subordinate to the other; whether Episcopal Ordination do introduce a new character or extend the old."—*Works*, II. 71. For the discussion on the subject at the Council of Trent, see Father Paul's *History*, p. 552, *seq.* 686.

[1] For example, we may see the reason why the Principals of the Universities were made accountable to the *Superintendents* in the *Book of Discipline*, ch. VII. sect. iv. 18.

[2] "Si *Consecrationis* nomine delectentur [Pontificii] fruantur sanè. Olim aliter locuta est vel Ecclesia ipsa Romana."—Bishop Andrewes, *Opusc. Posth.* p. 182.

of the title which I have prefixed to these remarks :—

"Nihil certius est quàm *omnem diminutionem Ordinis Episcopalis originem trahere ab usurpatione Papali;*[1] nihilque aliud mihi videtur Papa Romanus quàm unus homo vindicans sibi omnem auctoritatem concessam Episcopis per totum Orbem diffusis, et ex illâ auctoritate sibi soli arrogatâ, Regibus, Rebus-publicis, Ecclesiis Christianis minas intentans. . . . . *Primò* itaque Scholastici, Romano Pontifici adblandientes, duplex hoc fundamentum negandi distinctionem Ordinis excogitarunt. Ponunt enim Sacramentum Eucharistiæ in definitione Ordinis, cumque hoc Sacramento *limitant* atque *determinant.* Ita tandem apud Pontificios *septem* distincti ordines sunt: Ostiarius, Lector, Exorcista, Acolythus, Sub-diaconus, Diaconus, Presbyter. Inter Ordines Sacros *Episcopus nullibi est.* . . . . *Secundò,* . . . . volunt nihil aliud Episcopos esse quam Presbyteros a Presbyteris promotos, atque ideò cum fiunt Episcopi, non *Ordinatos* sed *Consecratos* dici." Having answered both these arguments, he sums up the *Determination* thus :—"Constans itaque Patrum Sententia est, OMNES EPISCOPOS FUISSE APOSTOLORUM OMNIUM SUCCESSORES. Et quod de distinctione Or-

[1] Compare Bramhall, *Works,* I. 252, *seq.*, and Jeremy Taylor, VI. 809. Bishop Pearson appears to have had the following words of the latter in his eye. "I shall say one thing more, which is indeed a great truth, that *the diminution of Episcopacy was first introduced by Popery;* and the Popes of Rome, by communicating to Abbots and other mere Priests special graces to exercise some essential offices of Episcopacy, have made this Sacred Order to be *cheap,* and *apt to be invaded.*" See also the able and just remarks of Bishop Russell, *History of Church in Scotland,* I. 163-167.

dinis observavimus, idem et de hac successione observandum; nempe, USURPATIONEM PAPALEM ESSE VERUM FUNDAMENTUM NEGANDI APOSTOLICAM SUCCESSIONEM EPISCOPORUM."[1]

I am unwilling to close this subject without adding the practical lessons which are contained in the following commentary on St. Matthew xxiii. 8, 9.

" '*Be not ye called Rabbi; for One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are Brethren. And call no man your Father on the earth, for One is your Father which is in Heaven.*' . . . Here our Lord lays down the great principle on which all precedence in His Eternal Kingdom will be regulated, and on which all Christian graces now are formed, and all this arising from some peculiar efficacy in the humiliations of Christ. Nor is it only the foundation of the Christian character in each individual, but the principle to be developed also in the history of the Church, according to the observance of which its strength and welfare would depend. Thus it is to be observed that the Church Catholic is known under no name but that of Christ, whereas all sects are distinguished by the name of some one whom they call their Father and Master.

" It may be the case in the Church itself; were individual influence much to prevail, the effect would not be Catholic, but peculiar, and stamped with human error. Again, there may be something of prophecy in this, as in many of our Lord's com-

[1] *Minor Theol. Works*, I. 274-286. See also *Ibid.* p. 434.

mands; for in the Church Catholic itself, Unity has been broken whenever this principle has been departed from; for to the Apostolic Body it has been said emphatically, 'all ye are Brethren.'

"But the Bishop of Rome has not been content with the precedence of an elder brother in the See of St. Peter, but *has claimed that of a Master and Father;* and this command of our Lord being broken, the unity and strength of the Church has been lost. But it may be asked, Does not this command militate against the authority of individual Bishops over their flocks altogether? It will be found on consideration that it does not do so; on the contrary, that this divinely commissioned authority is the only remedy against the ambition which breaks up societies. That this command, like every other, is not to be taken in the letter, but in the spirit, is evident; for, in the first place, we have natural Parents, and we have Masters to whom these appellations of reverence are due; and also in some sense Spiritual Fathers, for St. Paul, on more occasions than one, takes to himself the title of Father, and St. Peter also. But of course our Lord's caution is against what St. Paul condemns in those who said, "I am of Paul and I of Apollos." That the divinely delegated authority is to be regarded as such, is implied in the command of our Lord to obey those who "sit in Moses' seat;" but even in this case, if men are not content with yielding obedience to the authority, but give weight to the personal opinion even of any Bishop, *as distinguished from*

that of the Church, it would be to sin against this command."—Williams' *Holy Week*, p. 216, *seq.*

I have confined the proofs and illustrations of this chapter to a single point, namely, the connexion of a non-Episcopal system with the previously existing usurpation and aggressions of the Papacy. It would be no less easy to show that other defects of our Reformation mentioned in the foregoing Discourse, such as the Disuse of *Confirmation* and of *Liturgical worship*,[1] are to be traced originally to excesses and corruptions derived from the same source.

[1] See M'Crie, p. 10; Knox, III. 67. Principal Tulloch has remarked, that "the idea of extemporaneous Prayer as an appropriate vehicle of public devotion, was one quite unknown to the Reformation."—P. 377. But compare above, p. 21, note 2.

CHAPTER VII.

EVILS OF NATIONAL DISUNION IN ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS.

I MUST be content here, also, as in the preceding chapter, to notice so vast a subject only from a single point of view; and that shall be one upon which there can exist, I hope, no difference of opinion: I mean the solemn responsibility which attaches to us all to propagate among the Heathen, and, still more, to maintain in our own Colonial Dependencies, the pure gospel of Christ, upon Scriptural and Reformation principles, and to do both, as far as possible, in the true Christian spirit, not of jealousies and of divisions, but of Love and Unity. I can imagine few things more painful than when (speaking generally) a *Scotchman* and an *Englishman*, who have gone forth as Missionaries from the same Island, bearing with them, in some sort, the authority and the prestige of the same kingdom and nation, speaking the same tongue, carrying in their hands the same Bible, and professing to teach the same way of salvation, are called on (as must often be the case) to explain why it is, and how it is, that they who have

come to teach others are not yet agreed among themselves as to the message which they have to deliver, or, at least, as to the circumstances under which it is their duty to deliver it—a non-agreement which, in the eyes of the unenlightened Heathen, must be almost equally scandalous and embarrassing, whether it shall be represented to them as arising from matters of *great*, of *little*, or of *no* importance.

Upon this subject, however, I shall leave it altogether to others to speak, and especially to those who will be able to do so with most authority, as laying before us the results of actual experience.

First, then, to give the testimony of the great Orientalist of the seventeenth century, Dr. Edward Pocock:—"Upon this occasion, these two learned men (Pocock and Grotius) entered into a long discourse concerning the state of things in THE EAST, and the reasons why the holy Religion of Jesus Christ was so far from gaining ground in those countries that it was treated there by unbelievers with great contempt. Mr. Pocock mentioned several things which he observed to be thus fatally mischievous; but amongst them all, he told him there was nothing more so than the many schisms and divisions of those that own the name of Christ, who ought to be 'as one fold under one Shepherd.'"—Twell's *Life of Pocock*, p. 78.

There are some valuable remarks in the *Colonial Church Chronicle*, March 1857, pp. 98-100, by a writer who is evidently well acquainted with the present state of India, which show that the evils of Religious Disunion there felt are only yet in their commence-

ment, or rather are *held for the present comparatively in suspense,* because the various missionary Bodies, who are not in communion with each other, have hitherto been anxious to avoid collision, and there has been ample space, without mutual interference, for them all. What a melancholy consideration to think, as evangelization spreads throughout our great Eastern Empire—now become equally, as placed in the hands of our common Sovereign, the property both of Scotch and English—our "unhappy divisions" must grow more apparent and more baneful! What an appeal to all Christians at home to reconsider the grounds of their own position![1]

To pass from East to West, the following remarks, the result of many years' experience in the UNITED STATES AND CANADA, are full of salutary warning :—

"Consequences *pernicious and destructive even to the mother country,* result from the early neglect of its Colonial offspring. America exhibits, on a large scale, some remarkable effects consequent on *sectarian division.* Dissent has, in a fuller measure than in this country, worked out its legitimate results, and these results are *not* those which might be expected from the *Christianity of the Bible.* The first effect of religious division seems to be mutual animosity and bitterness, and a general breaking-up of what ought to be the harmonious structure of society. Different bodies become jealous of the influence of one another, and seek opportunities for diminishing

[1] See also *Colonial Church Chronicle* for the present month —February 1861—"On Presbyterianism in India," p. 46.

that influence by various demoralizing contrivances. If these bodies are pretty equally represented or patronized in the Legislature, the Government, almost as a matter of course, will become first *impartial*, and secondly *indifferent*. The next effect will be an intolerant liberalism, first forbidding (when it has the power) the inculcation of doctrine in connexion with Scripture, and next, when this prohibition has proved absurd, extending it to the Scriptures themselves: the public mind, at the same time, is undergoing a similar process; and men at length cease to quarrel about Religion, because little definite Religion remains to occasion animosity.

"But where is the cure to be found which can reach the source of this extensive and spreading malady?

"It appears that to give the Scriptures their proper place in the Christian scheme, and thereby to make them effectual to the promotion of liberty, we must connect them with the Doctrine and the Authority which existed at the time of their first promulgation. When this is accomplished, the Bible will not be overshadowed either by Roman additions to the faith, or by the equally injurious devices of modern Sectarian Theology. Now it is a fact that the Reformed Church in England and in America retains an embodiment of the *doctrine* of the primitive Church in its Creeds and in its Liturgies. It is also a fact that it possesses the *authority* of the Early Church conveyed from Christ through the imposition of hands. It is unnecessary to trace the steps of this succession, since it is enough to show that

from the time of the Apostles there have always been Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and that Consecration and Ordination have been, as a matter of history, constantly practised. As our descent from Adam is proved by the unvarying law of parentage, so in like manner, the constant regulations of the Church demonstrate our ecclesiastical descent from, and our connexion with, those who were commissioned to teach *all nations to the end of the world.*

"It would seem therefore, that so far as the Church acts in her original character, so far she fulfils the office of maintaining the Scriptures in their true position. And in proportion as she extends herself upon her Apostolic foundations, she more manifestly becomes *a centre of Unity* for the scattered sheep of Christ."—Caswall's *American Church,* p. 383, *seq.,* 387, *seq.*

In connexion with this extract, it must be surely a matter of interest to all Scotchmen that the Church of the United States, which is in Communion with the Church of England, derived the first germ of its now widely-diffused and numerous Episcopate from the Bishops of this Country in 1784.

The only complete History which we have of the Colonial Church thus draws our attention to one source of the evils in question, as they have existed, and unhappily still exist, not only in America, but *throughout the world*:—

"It is obvious that the removal of the Episcopal Church in Scotland from the position which she once

occupied in that country,—a position identical with that occupied by the National Church of our own, —and her depressed condition for nearly the whole of the last century, must have acted as a *sore discouragement and hindrance to the Church of England, in every foreign and domestic work throughout the same period.* It was not merely the withdrawal from her channels of usefulness of a large portion of the vigorous intellect and sturdy diligence and fervid piety which have ever been the heritage of the Scottish People; but the renewal also, and often with increased strength, of the *self-same evils abroad* which have acted with such destructive force at home. The importance of these facts, and the little regard paid to them in many quarters, have led me to direct attention to them."—Anderson's *History of the Colonial Church*, II. 536.

Passing now from America to AFRICA, it appears that our Colonists there are placed at disadvantage in comparison with the Dutch, on account of Religious Disunion.

"I was glad, however, to balance this seeming disparagement of Christianity or missionary zeal among the Dutch, by pointing out to my Companions, what has apparently not struck them before, that the Dutch Church, by its *unity*, was able to promote the social wellbeing of the country in founding new towns, which *an English population of five times the amount cannot do*, and seem in this land rarely to attempt, without a forced military expenditure, calling into activity most of the

elements of which a town is constituted. To this latter cause King William's Town, Fort Beaufort, and Fort Peddie (the last two proclaiming their birth by the appendage of 'Fort' to each of them), and, in no small degree, Grahamstown itself, are indebted for their existence. Whereas the Dutch can point in the same brief space of time to the rise of Burghersdorp, Humansdorp, Colesberg, Bloemfontein, besides Riversdale in the west, and perhaps to many other places, whose origin, and growth into a town or village, is *entirely* owing to the *one Dutch Church* to which all Dutchmen resort, and near to which aged Boers like to settle, without having their attention and their alms alike distracted, by maintaining several religious bodies as we English needs must do, even in such towns as Uitenhage, Somerset, and Cradock, where the Dutch Church still forms the principal religious feature of the place.

"Would that the idea of the value of unity in religious matters, could by any arguments, secular or spiritual, be forced upon the minds of our countrymen!"—Merriman's *Journal*, p. 166, *seq.*

"Here is another instance of what I have remarked upon before, this superiority of the Dutch to ourselves, in one at least of the great functions of our social and civilized life, viz., the founding of towns, arising entirely from the strength and unity of their Church. Ten times the number of English, in consequence of their religious divisions, could not do what the Dutch so easily achieve."—*Ibid.* p. 178.

The interesting Memoir of the late lamented Bishop

Armstrong supplies the following observation, applicable to the same region :—

"As I approached the town, I could not but be saddened by the thought of our religious divisions. No less than three places of worship were visible, besides the Church of England. This, in the midst of a population of some 700 people, was indeed a melancholy spectacle. What a waste of men, of zeal, of means for their support, when this 700 is split up into four divisions, each division requiring its own teacher. One earnest, faithful pastor might easily supply all the wants of the place."—Carter's *Life of Bishop Armstrong*, p. 347.

In regard to AUSTRALASIA, it will be universally admitted that we could not produce a witness more entitled to be heard than Bishop Selwyn. In the sermons which he preached before the University of Cambridge, when he was last in England, in 1854, that Apostolic Missionary delivered the following testimony, concerning the evils of Disunion in general, and especially those of which he himself was cognisant in the EXTREME SOUTH :—

"I leave it to you to judge of the effects of divisions here at home. Some may think that zeal is quickened, and that therefore good is done, by the rivalry of religious opinions : and they quote that passage in the Epistle to the Philippians, where St. Paul rejoices, that in *every* way Christ is preached. But though St. Paul there rejoices that Christ is preached, even though it were 'of envy and strife,' 'of contention,' and 'in *pretence*'—must we not believe that he would have

rejoiced infinitely more if he could have seen all men agreeing to preach Christ 'of goodwill,' and 'of love,' 'sincerely,' and 'in truth'? It is one thing to rejoice in the overruling Providence of God, which brings good out of evil; and it is another and a widely different thing to *acquiesce in the evil,* because by God's Providence it has been made the means of good. The same Lord, who prayed that 'all might be one,' foretold that His Gospel should 'not bring peace on earth, but rather division.' And yet there is no one of us who doubts on which side is the mind of Christ, or whether His example points to peace or to division, to the olive branch or to the sword? Perhaps even on this lower ground of practice and experience, if we were to go below the surface, we should find *a vast amount of unsuspected evil, resulting directly from the speculative and controversial manner in which Religion is taught.* If it could be proved that the crowded congregations of our Churches and Chapels of all religious persuasions, represent fairly and fully the state of Religion in the mass of the people, we might then rejoice with St. Paul, even in the midst of much strife and contention, that in any way Christ is preached. But if we have reason to suspect, or rather to *know,* that under this fair and visible surface of Religion, agitated indeed by waves but sparkling with sunbeams from Heaven, there lies *a dark and stagnant and unfathomable depth of Infidelity*—millions who believe nothing—and if we have reason to think that their *Unbelief* is caused by our *Divisions,* and that they would have been brought

home to *Christ* if they had seen us more loving and united in ourselves, then indeed, if this be so, we may well tremble, lest these controversies which we excuse *as incentives to zeal* should be found to have been stumblingblocks to our Brethren, and *we the men by whom the offence came.* I speak, of course, with diffidence of anything that relates to the state of religion in England, but *I am bold to speak of that which I have heard and seen in the Mission field.* There, I assert, without fear of contradiction, *schism is looked upon as an acknowledged evil.* There may be the utmost Charity and brotherly-kindness among the Missionaries themselves; but that is not enough: no inward and spiritual unity can act as an *outward evidence;* the keen-sighted native Convert soon detects a difference of system, and thus Religion brings Disunion instead of Harmony and Peace."—Bishop of New Zealand's *Four Sermons,* p. 59, *seq.*

As an echo to the foregoing, the following from the EXTREME NORTH was received in a letter written by the first Bishop of the last new Colonial Diocese —British Columbia—six months ago, July 1860:—

"I was present at a meeting at the latter place (Yale) on my way, when an address was presented to me, and the Chairman, *an American* and *Presbyterian,* called upon all present in this new land to forget the past differences, and to adopt the Church of England for their religion, as a Church in which they could have confidence, which *had a broad basis,* and which was at work among them."—See *English Churchman,* No. 939, p. 1259.

To return once more to THE EAST, I venture, in conclusion, to submit to the Reader two passages from Dr. Wolff's Travels to Bokhara :—

"I may say, without fear of any imputation of vanity, that I have now seen and made myself acquainted with all the branches of the Catholic Church, and with all the sects now existing on earth ; and I have not shunned to sit at the feet of the Bishops in the Roman Catholic Church, in the Armenian Church, in the Greek Church, in the Chaldean and Abyssinian Church, with Wesleyans, Independents, and learned Baptists ; and the result of my investigations is, that *the Church of England is the pearl of price and jewel of the earth,* and the mightiest masterpiece of Bible illustration, which the world has witnessed since it fell under the yoke of sin."—Vol. i. p. 67, *seq.*

And yet the author of this statement is no enemy to Presbyterianism :—

"I am always rejoiced to learn that Episcopalians send out Missionaries, but in the meantime, as long as this is not done, the state of the Eastern Churches is in such a sad condition, that *modest, prudent,* and *zealous* Presbyterians might be rendered useful to them ; and these very Presbyterian Missionaries would perceive, *from the state of the East,* that *Episcopacy is a primitive condition of the Church,* and Congregationalism an anomaly. And thus, while it cannot be denied that they enlighten the East, it will also follow that they take back with them to their own country a portion of its light, to the benefit of the

country from which they were sent forth."—*Ibid.* p. 189.

I have added this last quotation for the information of those who imagine that Episcopacy is not, and has not been from the beginning, as universal throughout the East (without any alliance with, but rather in the most determined opposition to, Popery) as it has been, and still is, for the most part, throughout Western Christendom.

POSTSCRIPT.

While the pages of Chapter II. were in the Press, the Author discovered that in his conjecture, p. 71, *respecting the origin of "the Twapenny Fayth," he has been anticipated by Dr. M'Crie, Life of Knox, Supplementary Note Y, p.* 348, *seq.*

EDINBURGH: T. CONSTABLE,
PRINTER TO THE QUEEN, AND TO THE UNIVERSITY.

BOUNTY
BURN
37 & 38
KIRBY ST